

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

THE JOURNAL *of the* American
Association *of* Collegiate Registrars
and Admissions Officers



OCTOBER, 1952

VOLUME TWENTY-EIGHT

NUMBER ONE

7
S

E
I
E
C
T
T

R
D

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

THE JOURNAL of the American
Association of Collegiate Registrars
and Admissions Officers

TRENDS AND PROBLEMS IN COLLEGE ADMISSIONS	5
..... <i>Horace W. Sturgis</i>	
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS AND THE STREAM OF SCHOLARSHIP	17
..... <i>Vaughn D. Bornet</i>	
VOCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF SOPHOMORES AT NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY	31
..... <i>William H. Brown</i>	
THE NEW YORK STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATION AS A PROGNOSTIC INDEX OF COLLEGE SUCCESS	44
..... <i>Sherman N. Tinkelman</i>	
DISCRIMINATION IN COLLEGE OPPORTUNITIES AND ADMISSIONS: A CRITIQUE OF TWO PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION	49
..... <i>Frank K. Shuttleworth</i>	
CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES GET FEDERAL AID ...	73
..... <i>Edward F. Sheffield</i>	
GRADUATE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS FROM ACCREDITED AND UNACCREDITED UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES ..	77
..... <i>George W. Angell</i>	
GOOD WILL IN REPLYING TO LETTERS FROM FOREIGN STUDENTS SEEKING ADMISSION	80
..... <i>Dell Lebo</i>	
THE OHIO FOUNDATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES	83
..... <i>J. Gordon Howard</i>	
TEACHING THE BIBLE IN NON-SECTARIAN COLLEGES ...	91
..... <i>A. C. Howell</i>	
SURVEY OF THE USE OF THE GRADE "INCOMPLETE" AND OTHER GRADES TO INDICATE COURSES NOT COMPLETED DURING THE SEMESTER OF REGISTRATION	112
..... <i>Richard L. Tutbill</i>	
EDITORIAL COMMENT	116
IN THE OFFICE	117
BOOK REVIEWS	120
COMMITTEE REPORTS	130
TREASURER'S REPORT	135
THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL AACRAO CONVENTION IN MINNEAPOLIS, APRIL 20-23, 1953	137
REPORTED TO US	139
DIRECTORY OF REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS IN MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS	148

Contributors to This Issue

GEORGE W. ANGELL is Dean of the College, State University Teachers College, New Paltz, New York.

J. D. LEITH is Associate Dean of Students at Lehigh University.

VAUGHN D. BORNET is Research Associate of the Institute of American History at Stanford University.

EDWARD F. SHEFFIELD is Registrar of Carleton College, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

WILLIAM H. BROWN is Director of the Bureau of Educational Research, North Carolina College at Durham.

FRANK K. SHUTTLEWORTH is Professor in the Department of Student Life, Division of Testing and Guidance, City College of New York.

J. GORDON HOWARD is President of Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio.

HORACE W. STURGIS is Associate Registrar at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

A. C. HOWELL is Professor of English and Secretary of the Faculty at the University of North Carolina.

SHERMAN N. TINKELMAN is Supervisor of Test Development for the New York State Education Department.

DELL LEBO is a graduate assistant and doctoral student at the Florida State University. His article herein is one outcome of his recent practicum experience in the Office of the Registrar.

RICHARD L. TUTHILL is University Registrar at the University of Kentucky.



Chase News Photo, Washington, D.C.

BREAKFAST OF PAST PRESIDENTS WASHINGTON, APRIL 23, 1952

Seated, left to right: J. A. Gannett, 23-24; Ira M. Smith, 27-28; Edith D. Cockins, 38-39; J. G. Quick, 32-33; J. C. MacKinnon, 40-41; Elwood Kastner, 50-51; Ezra L. Gillis, 19-20; A. H. Larson, 41-42; Fred L. Kerr, 37-38; R. E. McWhinnie, 49-50 (in corner); Ernest C. Miller, 45-46; Carrie Mae Probst, 47-48.

Standing, left to right: George P. Tuttle, 25-26; William S. Hoffman, 39-40; John E. Fellows, 51-52; R. Fred Thomason, 48-49; S. Woodson Canada, 46-47; E. J. Howell, 41-42.

OCTOBER
1952

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY

VOLUME 28
NUMBER 1

THE JOURNAL *of the* American
Association of Collegiate Registrars
and Admissions Officers

Trends and Problems in College Admissions

HORACE W. STURGIS

I

A BRIEF review of some of the early developments of the admissions practices in our colleges is helpful in understanding some of the current problems in college admissions.

During the early years in the history of American colleges it was not uncommon for the college to furnish both the pre-college and the college levels of training. That this proved to be an undesirable practice may be shown by one of the purposes given for the organizational meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1895—"To develop preparatory schools and cut off this work from the colleges".¹

In a presidential address on November 14, 1912, Chancellor James H. Kirkland of Vanderbilt University gave further meaning to the purposes for which the Southern Association was organized by making the following statement:

While our Association was formed for the purpose of general co-operation in all the work of school and college, yet our attention was first directed to one particular task, the adjustment of the relationship between the high school and the college. At that time most colleges con-

¹ Guy E. Snavely, *A Short History of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*, (Reprinted from Southern Association Quarterly, Vol. IX, November, 1945) p. 3.

ducted preparatory classes. Students left the high school at almost any stage of their preparation and applied for admission to college. If it appeared excusable they were admitted to the freshman class; if this seemed impossible, they entered one of the subfreshman classes. The effect of such a practice on the schools can easily be imagined and, indeed, is well remembered by most of us. There was no opportunity left for independent school work of a high grade. Colleges and schools competed for the same students, and, unfortunately, the colleges won in too many cases.²

Having found it desirable to make a definite distinction between the work of the secondary school and the college it then became necessary to establish criteria (entrance requirements) for the purpose of determining when a student should be permitted to transfer from the secondary school to the college.

As early as 1643 Harvard University stated its requirements for admission to the college as:

When any scholar is able to understand Tully or such like classical Latin extempore, and make and speak Latin in verse and prose; . . . and decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue, let him then, and not before, be capable of admission into the college.³

Harvard University was certainly no exception in its stress on Latin and Greek as is illustrated by the following resolution which was adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in November, 1895:

Resolved, that the Association strongly sympathizes with the development of the State public school systems and believes that the best interests of popular education demand the insertion in the curriculum of the public schools of four years instruction in Latin, and as soon as practicable two years in Greek.⁴

The importance of Latin and Greek in the early days of our colleges was due largely to the emphasis placed on the theological and philosophical areas of learning. Latin and Greek were the accepted languages of scholars in these fields. Today, however, only a small number of colleges are requiring Latin or Greek as compared with the year

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³ William Chauncy Langdon, *Everyday Things in American Life (1607-1776)*, New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938, p. 319.

⁴ Snavely, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

1900 when about 50 per cent of the colleges listed Latin as an entrance requirement.⁵

Although the actual entrance requirements will vary from college to college, most of the colleges are today requiring a basic pre-college program which includes work in English, mathematics, languages, and the natural and social sciences. These are not very different from the requirements of many colleges in the Southern Association as early as 1907 when the number of specific units required for admission by the member colleges ranged from ten to fifteen. The ten units prescribed by the Association as "minimum requirements" in 1907 were:⁶

English	3	Greek	2
History	1/2	Mathematics	1 1/2
Geography	1/2		
Latin	2 1/2	Total	10

II

In general, most colleges today are requiring a minimum of fifteen Carnegie units of secondary school work. Although many of the colleges require that these fifteen units include work in specific areas, the trend is toward permitting students a more liberal choice of the subjects required for admission to the college. In addition to the specific units that are required, most colleges are employing other methods to assist them in the selection of the more capable students. Some of the criteria used as a basis for this selection are:

1. Graduation from an accredited secondary school.
2. Rank in secondary school graduating class.
3. Recommendation of secondary school principal.
4. Entrance examinations.
5. Personal interview.
6. Extra-curricular activities in the secondary school.

The publicly supported colleges, in general, have more liberal admissions policies than do the private colleges. In fact some state universities are required by law to admit any resident of the state who is a graduate of an accredited high school.

Benjamin Fine in a recent study of the admissions practices in over 450 colleges and universities found that the admissions policies on the

⁵ Benjamin Fine, *Admission to American Colleges*, New York, London: Harper & Brothers, 1946, p. 3.

⁶ Snavely, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

whole are quite rigid, although there is a trend toward greater flexibility.⁷ He further found two opposing philosophies concerning the admission of students to college.⁸ One argues that the certificate from an accredited secondary school is the preferred basis for admission while the other holds that the use of the entrance examination is the better method. There is a definite trend toward the use of entrance examinations although most colleges are using the examination to supplement the certificate rather than as the sole basis for determining a student's eligibility for admission. Many states have inaugurated state-wide testing programs which are administered in the secondary schools. In most instances the results of such programs are used for counseling and guidance rather than as a single basis for admitting students to college.

Some of the arguments given both for and against the certificate and the entrance examination are:⁹

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

1. Examinations stress and determine ability to possess knowledge, to use knowledge, and to produce it on demand.
2. They require comprehensive grasp of a subject studied over a period of time.
3. They enable the college to define its standards more accurately.
4. They influence the schools to maintain high standards.
5. They are good training for life.
6. They make the student self-reliant.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE USE OF ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS

1. They overtax the nervous system of growing students.
2. They are inadequate and cover only one of many requisite qualifications.
3. They test memory rather than ability.
4. They encourage cramming.
5. They test knowledge and not appreciation.
6. They minimize the true conception of learning.
7. They lend themselves to injustice to the student.
8. They introduce the element of gambling into education.
9. They inflict a heavy burden upon the college.
10. Any moral effect examinations may have, may be obtained otherwise.
11. Their prognostic value is uncertain.

⁷ Fine, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE CERTIFICATE

1. The certificate encourages closer articulation between secondary and higher education.
2. It simplifies the process of admission by eliminating cumbersome entrance examinations.
3. It promotes the natural progress of the student by removing artificial barriers between two stages in his education.
4. It is fair to the student, because his fitness is judged on the basis of full knowledge of his ability over a relatively long period of time.
5. It ensures a better type of student for the college.
6. It is fair to those who do not intend to go to college, because it relieves teachers from coaching for entrance examinations and enables them to devote proper attention to the deserving majority.
7. It promotes high standards among secondary schools as a result of their closer relationships with the college.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE USE OF THE CERTIFICATE

1. The certificate method, based on the inspection of a school, often cramps the initiative of the school much more than the examination does.
2. The inspection is oftentimes perfunctory and does not give a true picture of the quality of work done in the school.
3. No two schools have the same standards, and a lack of homogeneity in the preparation of prospective students thus results.
4. The recommendation of a poorly prepared candidate may bring unfair discrimination against deserving students who may come subsequently from the same school.
5. The certificate method fosters a tendency to avoid tests of accurate scholarship.
6. The certificate method does not adequately care for individual differences.
7. The certificate method is hard to administer effectively and it encourages purely quantitative measurement of scholastic attainments.
8. A large percentage of those to whom a high school certificate is fittingly awarded cannot do college work, and colleges that admit chiefly by this method and maintain reasonable standards are usually forced to drop an unduly large percentage of students.

Some colleges, and particularly those for women, rely heavily on the results of a personal interview. Sarah Lawrence college, for example, places a great deal of emphasis on an interview with both the parent and the student before accepting the student for admission to the college.

According to the findings of the President's Commission on Higher Education the students considered most eligible for admission to colleges are those who have taken the so-called "academic" course and those who have graduated from an accredited high school.¹⁰ The Commission further found that of the 60 per cent of the young people of high school age who are attending our secondary schools, less than half are taking the "academic" course designed to prepare them for college and of these only one in three actually enters college.¹¹

III

There seems to be general agreement that the secondary school record of courses and grades which is used as the principal criterion in determining a student's eligibility to enter college is, in itself, inadequate. The large number of students who drop out of college certainly supports this belief.

Studies conducted at the Georgia Institute of Technology have shown that less than half of an entering freshman class can be expected to complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree.¹² Even assuming that many of the fifty per cent who do not complete the requirements for the degree do transfer to another college and earn a degree, there is a considerable number of students who find that their original choice of a college did not meet their needs or capacities.

A study of the degree candidates for the two years of 1948 and 1949 at the Georgia Institute of Technology showed that of 1765 bachelor's degrees conferred during this period, a total of 894 degrees were awarded in curricula other than that chosen by the student upon his matriculation into the college.¹³ In other words, 56 per cent of the students receiving degrees during this period received their degrees in a school of specialization different from their original choice when admitted to the Institute. Furthermore, this study does not account for the 50 per cent of the students who enter a freshman class and withdraw before completing the requirements for a degree.

¹⁰ George F. Zook, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, New York: Harper & Brothers, Vol. II, p. 41.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Horace W. Sturgis, *A Study of Mortality Rates at the Georgia Institute of Technology*, (Unpublished 1950).

¹³ Horace W. Sturgis, *A Study of the Relationship Between the Student's Original Choice of Curricula and the Degree Earned by the Student* (Unpublished 1950).

IV

The inadequacy of basing eligibility for admission to college on a fixed pattern of secondary school subjects was further demonstrated in the "Eight Year Study", prepared for the Progressive Education Association.¹⁴ This study showed that the actual subjects studied in the secondary school were less significant in predicting a student's success in college than the student's over-all intellectual capacity. This study concluded that, "no college can be justified in setting up requirements for admission which have been shown to be unnecessary in preparing students to do college work . . . ; second, the knowledge, skills, habits, and qualities of mind and character essential as preparation for college work should be ascertained by colleges and schools co-operatively; and third, a plan for admission should be adopted which provides the college with needed information concerning candidates, but which does not prescribe the content or organization of the secondary school curriculum".

The inadequacy of the fixed pattern of subjects as the principal basis for determining a student's eligibility for admission to a college was illustrated by a study conducted at the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1949.¹⁵ According to the study those students who were admitted to the college without high school physics were as successful in their study of college physics as those students who had completed a course in high school physics before being admitted.

V

In general, it is the function of an admissions officer in a college to determine, within the limits of the established policies of his institution, who should be admitted to his college. Under ideal conditions this is a difficult function to perform, but during the next few years it is going to be even more difficult.

For the past five years the colleges have been deluged with large numbers of students seeking admission. The increase in enrollments has been chiefly due to the large number of veterans who have returned from the war to complete their college training. This increase has resulted in a general expansion of educational facilities and budg-

¹⁴ Zook, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

¹⁵ Horace W. Sturgis, *A Study of the Effects of a Course in High School Physics upon the Success of Students in the Study of College Physics* (Unpublished 1949).

ets which are now having to be trimmed because of a rapid decline in enrollments.

The colleges are primarily concerned with the selection of those students who have the capacities, needs, and interests to benefit from a college education, and they are, at the same time, concerned with securing students in sufficient numbers to help finance their expanded facilities. These are problems which tend to create a conflict in the policies which govern the admissions practices of a college.

Some colleges have employed field representatives to go out into the secondary schools and "sell" the facilities of their particular institution. In many states the secondary schools have organized "College" and "Career Day" programs inviting the college representatives to come and talk to interested students. Some such programs have been developed by the secondary schools in self defense to take care of the steady stream of college representatives who have been beating a path to their doors asking for the time of their students. Some programs have been developed because of an organized effort on the part of the colleges, encouraging the secondary schools to allow time for the representatives of the colleges to visit the schools for the purpose of interviewing prospective students. In one southern state there were 16 "College Day" programs last year, this year there were 47, and they are planning for 84 next year. One small state has for the past two years conducted a state-wide "College Night" program.

VI

There is a real concern on the part of many regarding the problem of the student's selection of a college. How does the student select the college which will best suit his interests, needs and capacities? In many states the colleges and secondary schools are attempting to give aid to this problem by co-operating in the establishment of counseling and guidance programs.

In order to determine some measure of the reasons why students choose a particular college the Georgia Institute of Technology submitted a questionnaire to 465 third quarter freshmen asking them to indicate the items which played a part in their decision to enter Georgia Tech.¹⁶ The results of the most popular items are shown in Table 1.

¹⁶ Faculty Committee on Student Orientation, *Student Opinion Questionnaire*, Georgia Institute of Technology (Unpublished 1951).

TABLE 1
STUDENT OPINIONS OF REASONS WHY THEY CHOSE TO ENTER
GEORGIA TECH.

Item	Frequency
Scholastic and professional reputation of the college.....	400
Interest in engineering.....	320
Recommendation of parents.....	215
Recommendation of a former student of the college.....	182
College catalogue.....	171
Recommendation of a college student friend.....	161
Location of college in city of Atlanta.....	155
Recommendation of high school teacher.....	138
Recommendation of some other person.....	138
An opportunity to live away from home.....	132
ROTC programs.....	131
An interest in athletics.....	118

Another measure of the reasons why students attend college was secured on the same questionnaire.¹⁷ Students were asked to rank their reasons by placing a "1", "2" or "3" in front of their reasons, using "1" for the most important reason, "2" for the next most important, and "3" for their least important reason. These were converted to numerical equivalent scores by assigning weights of 3 to "1", 2 to "2", and 1 to "3". The results are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
STUDENT OPINIONS OF REASONS WHY THEY CHOSE TO ENTER
GEORGIA TECH.

Reason	Score
I wanted to prepare myself for a better-paying job than I would otherwise be able to secure.....	843
I felt a need for further education.....	670
A college degree is necessary to enter the profession I have chosen.....	486
My family expected me to go to college.....	249
I wanted to make social contacts and develop my social skills.....	105
Coming to college just seemed to be the logical thing to do.....	75
I wanted a chance to enjoy college life.....	72

On the same questionnaire the students were asked: "If you could begin again would you choose another college"? Eighteen per cent of the students indicated they would choose another college if they could begin again. This same question was asked of 10,000 veteran and

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

non-veteran students in 16 American colleges and the percentages of responses indicating, "uncertain or would definitely attend some other college" ranged from 12 per cent to 85 per cent.¹⁸

VII

Even though current budgetary needs may be causing the college to be concerned with the securing of larger numbers of students, the college admissions officer must not permit himself to lose sight of the purposes for which his college exists. For this reason he should have a definite philosophy to guide him in his work.

An expression as to what this philosophy should *not* be has been given by G. W. Rosenlof, Registrar and Director of Admissions of the University of Nebraska, who said:

Admissions is not merely finding students to enter our institutions. It is not merely a matter of going out as some institutions do, to recruit students for the institution, the recruiting being done by individuals who have a high value from the standpoint of their sales abilities and who are not particularly concerned with whether or not the students they recruit fit into the program of the institution.¹⁹

In the development of his philosophy the college admissions officer should keep three concepts in mind: first, the philosophy, purposes and objectives of his college; second, the needs of society; third, and most important of all, the student himself—his needs and capacities.

The responsibilities of the admissions officer are just as pronounced for those who are not admitted as for those who are admitted to his college. The responsibility to the student who is not admitted must be weighed in terms of the effect it will have on the student if he is not permitted to continue his study. Very often the student who is denied admission to a particular college can be given guidance and counseling which will be helpful to him in continuing his education at another college or in another area of learning. Merely to deny a student admission is to impose an arbitrary handicap upon the student and to produce a tremendous waste of human resources which might otherwise be utilized if the student were guided into an area of learning in keeping with his capacities, interests and needs.

¹⁸ Norman Frederiksen and W. B. Schrader, *Adjustment to College*, Educational Testing Service, Research Bulletin, 50-20, Princeton, N.J., 1950.

¹⁹ G. W. Rosenlof, *Toward Improving the Admission Procedure*, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY, Vol. XXII (1946), p. 39.

There are those who believe the colleges should select only the intellectually superior student. On the other hand there are those who believe that all who can profit or benefit from a college education should be admitted. If the philosophy of the admissions officer agrees with the latter belief, it then becomes his responsibility to determine the real factors which are important in the selection of students for admission to his college. Selection on this basis cannot be made on any arbitrary or single device, but must be made on a flexible set of criteria which have been proved to be reasonably valid.

VIII

SUMMARY

The general practice in college admissions during recent years has been to admit those students who have graduated from accredited secondary schools and who have earned credit in specific patterns of secondary school subjects. The pattern of subjects required for admission has varied with the college, but the trend is toward permitting greater flexibility in the student's choice of subjects. Due to the recognized inadequacy of these criteria alone, the colleges have recently been placing more emphasis upon entrance examinations, the interview, and personal data regarding the student.

Many colleges are finding that the student's intellectual capacity, his level of maturity, his qualities of character, and his seriousness of purpose are of greater significance in predicting his chances of success in college than purely the academic record of his secondary school performance. Such factors as the student's ability to read with speed and comprehension, his ability to make value judgments, and his ability to express himself orally and in writing are proving to be of great importance in determining whether or not he can benefit from a college education.

If these qualities are significant in predicting the success of students in college, it is then important for the colleges to make careful appraisals of their admissions practices and to develop the best methods of selecting those students who have these desired qualities. The current decline in college enrollments is providing an opportunity for the colleges to make these appraisals and at the same time to prepare for the expected growth in enrollments which has been predicted for the future.

IX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Faculty Committee on Student Orientation, "Student Opinion Questionnaire", (Georgia Institute of Technology, Unpublished, 1951)
- Fine, Benjamin. *Admission to American Colleges*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946, 225 pp.
- Frederiksen, N. and Schrader, W. B. *Adjustment to College*. Research Bulletin 50-20 prepared by Educational Testing Service. Princeton, N.J., 1950.
- Langdon, W. C. *Everyday Things in American Life (1607-1776)*. New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938, pp. 353.
- MacIntosh, Archibald. *Behind the Academic Curtain*, New York: Harper & Bros., 1948, 165 pp.
- Roper, Elmo B. *Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College*. A report for the Committee on a Study of Discriminations in College Admissions, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1949.
- Rosenlof, G. W. "Toward Improving the Admission Procedure." *COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY*, Vol. XXII: 38-48, 1946.
- Snively, Guy E., *A Short History of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*, Reprinted from Southern Association Quarterly, Volume IX, November, 1945, pp. 423-549.
- Sturgis, H. W., "A Study of Mortality Rates at the Georgia Institute of Technology", (Unpublished, 1950)
- Sturgis, H. W., "A Study of the Relationship Between the Student's Original Choice of Curricula and the Degree Earned by the Student," (Georgia Institute of Technology, Unpublished, 1950)
- Sturgis, H. W., "A Study of the Effects of a Course in High School Physics upon the Success of Students in the Study of College Physics," (Georgia Institute of Technology, Unpublished, 1949)

Doctoral Dissertations and the Stream of Scholarship

VAUGHN D. BORNET

HOW MANY scholars are likely to read any of the 7,339 dissertations accepted for doctoral degrees in the academic year 1950-51? Few persons claim to look forward with pleasure to reading dissertations. Even scholars often refer to them as heavily documented, often humorless, and sometimes disjointed narrative or statistical exercises of no particular value. Jokes about them have become common. It is time to reverse this trend. Dissertations contain much new information. They also present many old facts rearranged in new patterns. Dissertations deserve a fair chance to be read and used by those specialists best able to profit from them. Costs of publication in book form, however are continuing to climb.

It is the purpose of this article to discuss how to get dissertations before a limited but interested reading audience cheaply and conveniently.

Suggestions will be made here of ways in which universities can improve and standardize their physical handling of completed and bound dissertations. The new microfilm publication program proposed by the Association of Research Libraries will be summarized and discussed. Attention is invited to the need for technical revisions in postal regulations in order to keep dissertations already on file from gathering additional dust in their present depositories. A summary of the recommendations for remedial action on these and other matters will appear at the close of the article.

It must be presumed that dissertations will be prepared in the future, as in the past, by a cross section of the graduate school population. Some will be prepared by serious candidates for the Ph. D. who have been well trained in appropriate skills and have worked under competent instructors. These can be counted on to produce manuscripts of professional quality. Other students will not match their performance, of course. The problem considered here, in any case, is solely how to spread abroad the insights, facts, and bibliographical contributions contained in all dissertations.

I

The 7,339 approved dissertations of 1950-51 were the product of students at 106 universities. This compares with the pre-war total (1941) of 3,526, the war-time low (1945) of 1,576, and the steadily increasing post-war figures (1947 to 1950) of 2,587, 3,609, 4,853, and 6,510 respectively. A breakdown by subject groups shows the Social Sciences in the lead with 2,194 dissertations. Then come Physical Sciences with 2,183, Biological Sciences 1,932, Humanities 674, Earth Sciences 199, Religion 190, and Philosophy 105.¹

Chemistry was the most popular subject with 1,110 dissertations. Others in the top ten were Education 1,070, Psychology 524, Physics 472, Economics 399, Engineering 353, English Literature 302, Biochemistry 301, History 251, and Bacteriology and Microbiology 238.² Degrees in Education constituted 14.6 per cent of the total in 1950-51 compared with 13.5 in 1945-46, 9.7 in 1940-41, and 14 in 1931-32. A boom in Psychology has occurred and was expected—as was the decline in the Classics.

Twenty-four universities in 1950-51 approved more than a hundred dissertations each. The top five were: Columbia 676 (242 of which were in Education), Wisconsin 360, Harvard 353, Chicago 329, and California (Berkeley) 260.³ The order in which the top five appeared

¹ These figures and those immediately following were computed from *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities, 1950-1951* (New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1951). Included in this volume were 138 dissertations accepted for degrees in previous years but only recently reported. It was not possible to subtract these from any of the detailed totals, although they are not represented in the 7,339 total. Scholars are indebted to Arnold H. Trotter of the University of Illinois Library for the work he has performed on this reference set, as well as to Marian Harman, his associate, and their predecessors.

² The second ten among the 49 disciplines listed were: Religion 190, Mathematics 187, Agriculture 185, Sociology 161, Political Science 160, Romance Literature 117, Geology 117, Zoology 112, Botany 108, and Philosophy 105. All the remainder were under a hundred each.

Analyses of trends within individual disciplines appear in their journals from time to time. A survey of research trends in one subject, American History, is: Edgar Eugene Robinson, *Scholarship and Cataclysm, Teaching and Research in American History, 1939-1945* (Stanford, Stanford Univ. Press, 1947).

³ The others were: Cornell 260, Ohio State 259, Illinois 240, N.Y.U. 235, Michigan 217, Minnesota 194, Yale 185, Stanford 175, Iowa 165, Purdue 164, Northwestern 152, Pennsylvania 146, Rutgers 125, Texas 116, M.I.T. 113, Princeton 111, Southern California 109, Iowa State 108, and U.C.L.A. 105.

These figures include dissertations for doctoral degrees in Education, Science, Jurisprudence, Canon Law, and Theology. They do not, of course, include Bachelor of Laws or Doctor of Medicine degrees.

in 1950-51 changed somewhat from 1949-50. Then it was Harvard 526, Columbia 458, Wisconsin 296, Chicago 295, and California 243. These are figures on dissertations accepted, not on degrees granted.

II

What fate befell the 7,339 doctoral dissertations deposited in university libraries in 1950-51? How were they handled? Practices differ. It is the current policy of three universities not to require that any copy of the dissertation be placed on deposit in their libraries. Fourteen others ask only one copy, 69 want two, 17 demand three, one seeks four, and one (Pittsburgh) actually wishes five for its library. It is strange that no uniform custom has developed on this matter, but inasmuch as some universities expect a copy to be placed in the hands of the guiding professor or the major department, it may be that three copies is actually about the standard requirement.

It will be profitable in this connection to quote from a letter recently received by a research student trying to arrange an inter-library loan of a dissertation from one major university to another. He quickly found that there had been only one copy placed in the library. A dean wrote apologetically that until about fifteen years ago only one copy had been required. "Unfortunately," this official added, "it is the policy of the University not to lend doctoral dissertations when the Library has only one copy. I am not entirely in accord with this policy. . . . At the same time, I realize that the doctoral dissertation is an integral part of the University and perhaps the policy is sound."

That university published no abstracts in earlier years, and the dissertation in question may be seen only by paying a microfilming charge of three cents per page. The fee must be paid, obviously, without any guide to the contents in advance beyond the short title. Correspondence with the author in this case revealed that he had "misaid" his copy of both the dissertation and his typed abstract some years before. Here is an object lesson of some sort in research futility.

In another case a letter addressed by a faculty member to the librarian of a great university asking for a very brief description of a dissertation, really little more than its physical appearance, was never even acknowledged. That university publishes no abstracts. Is it any wonder that there is duplication of effort in American doctoral research? Is it so surprising that dissertations come to be taken lightly by all save a few doctoral candidates, their wives, and their parents?

Universities seem far from agreement on matters of documentation, paper quality, binding, and neatness in general. A small sample of dissertations obtained from various parts of the country on interlibrary loan in recent months varied greatly in these respects. Universities should insist on heavy rag content bond paper, clean and accurate professional quality typing, copies prepared with the best quality carbon paper manufactured, texts numbered in a single arabic numeral series throughout, standard citation systems fully approved by the scholarly world, complete and sensibly organized bibliographical citations, and footnotes at the *bottom* of the page. This final point, once left to the consciences of typists, will shortly become vital. When a sentence and its footnote become separated by 25 to 500 frames of microfilm, for example, a manuscript is no longer readable in the usual sense of the word.

Doctoral candidates may not like the next suggestion, but there is every reason why they should be required to have one bound and one unbound copy of their dissertation prepared for themselves. To guarantee that they do, these two copies should be submitted for proper signature and approval along with those due the university. The mechanics of revising entire dissertations or parts of them for book or journal publication make these two copies quite necessary. The new Ph. D. will find a number of occasions when he is glad that he has one looseleaf copy to edit and revise and another to show in its binding, intact, to interested scholars or employers.

Libraries do not always give masters' theses and dissertations the same card cataloging treatment they give printed books. Several libraries appear to prepare only one card for their main catalog—an author entry. Even *Forever Amber* gets author and title cards printed by the Library of Congress and gets in addition a subject entry under "Great Britain—History—Charles II, 1660-1685—Fiction." Since the chief contribution of some dissertations may actually be bibliographical, there should be entries made under appropriate headings. Visiting scholars can often find more information on books and manuscripts located in a given area from the bibliographies of new dissertations than they can by the usual means.

Duplicate library cards on dissertations and theses, marked with the university name, should go to the Library of Congress. Author cards could then go in the National Union Catalog, and subject cards could go to a special file. Think what it would mean if this practice

had been followed since 1900. Masters' theses, now impossible to find without exhausting effort, could be located with relative ease. Although Industrial Relations Institute librarians co-operate to compile an annual union list of work done in their specialization, a list which includes both senior and masters' theses, they are almost alone in their pioneer effort.

III

It does not seem to be a universal practice today to require doctoral candidates to make the time-consuming but necessary search through guides to doctoral dissertations *in progress* before beginning their research. One reason is that these guides, where they exist, have been prepared by their compilers in the face of difficulties which compelled uneven results. Using one recently, this writer inquired of the department head at an Eastern university what progress had been made by one student. Although he had been listed as "in progress," the reply was that this candidate for the Ph. D. had not been seen around the graduate school in a decade, was thought to be living in Oregon, and was expected never to finish.

The truth is that these guides, prepared with limited funds as a labor of love for publication in various journals or, occasionally, in pamphlet form, cannot do the job that needs to be done. A single volume, appearing annually under the title *Doctoral Dissertations in Progress in American Universities*, is needed. Reproduction could be by an offset process in double columns. Departmental chairmen could compile lists and forward them to a university official; he could send them to a central spot. It would do the task satisfactorily, and costs might be met by placing a price on the volume and by some form of subsidy.

This volume would not meet the great need for an annual survey of *all* research in progress, but that would be a heavy financial burden to prepare. It is the sort of thing that the United States Office of Education might and should do. At present the External Research Staff of the Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State, has developed what is called "a consolidated catalog of non-government research-in-progress in the social sciences in foreign areas and international problems." Both pre- and post-doctoral research are included, for the group estimates that 85 per cent of the formally recognized research in progress in universities is not reflected in any published

lists. It is expected that 1,500 projects will be listed shortly, and 500 which deal with the Soviet Union have been uncovered already. Those working in the foreign areas field should communicate with this group.

The Committee on Labor Market Research of the Social Science Research Council issued yearly guides from 1946 to 1949 entitled *University Research Programs in the Field of Labor*. These served a useful purpose, and similar lists are always needed. Why should two scholars in North Carolina and Washington State, for example, spend time, money, and energy unknowingly on identical projects when there is so much that our society wants and needs to know?

IV

From 1913 to 1940 the Library of Congress issued a list entitled *List of Doctoral Dissertations Printed* which covered the years 1912 through 1938, but it included only dissertations received by that library. Since 1933, however, there has been issued each year the more helpful compilation *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted in American Universities*. It is of great value to serious scholars under present circumstances. While it may be discontinued when no longer needed as part of the new microfilm plan to be discussed shortly, there are ways in which the annual volumes might be improved now.

The present method of listing titles by university names within broad subject groups leaves something to be desired. The compiler of the book has only dissertation titles to go on. If he could have submitted to him in addition a guiding sentence of description, he might be able to arrange his physical science titles under sub-headings and his social science titles within chronological groups. The separation of Political Science, History, Economics, Sociology, Speech, and English Literature into individual units means that users of the book have numerous places to check, especially for biographical subjects. Historians might not guess, for example, that dissertations have been prepared recently on both Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt as public speakers. If each item should be given a number, it would be easy to provide indices by university and author.

V

The publication of dissertation abstracts is no longer the rule. Printing costs have forced all but 25 universities to drop the practice. Six-

teen of these are state supported institutions. Five of the 25 are in the Northeast, while six, interestingly, are in the South. Such famous names as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, and California have retreated from the field. Fordham, Minnesota, Stanford, and L. S. U. are among those still carrying on, and Ohio State publishes abstracts of masters' theses as well as those for the Ph. D., but how long any of these universities will continue to do so is questionable.

Abstracts are sometimes published in learned journals, especially in the sciences, but these abstracts are hard to locate. The International Federation for Documentation, when trying to provide a guide to abstracting and indexing services in pure and applied science asserted, "In carrying out the work it became more and more evident that the present status of the abstracting work in the whole world is still very confusing."⁴ The Department of State project mentioned previously has prepared a volume of dissertation abstracts completed in its special field of interest during 1951. It plans to distribute the book to interested research students.

The requirement calling for publication of a dissertation previous to the granting of a degree persists in 37 universities, but it is clear that most of them have been forced to recognize its impracticality. Columbia University and most of the other large universities no longer even preserve the publication requirement on paper. Microfilm publication, however, has been making big gains.

VI

Once dissertations have been typed carefully, placed on deposit in an appropriate manner, catalogued completely, and announced to the world, an obvious question arises. Are these dissertations in any real sense *available* to scholars?

As the situation stands today, it is difficult not only to print dissertations, but to borrow them as well. The price of shipment by Railway Express and by the first class mail upon which the United States postal authorities insist is quite high. Neither book rate nor parcel post service is permitted on typed manuscripts, whether bound or not, unless

⁴ *List of Current Abstracting and Indexing Services* (The Hague, UNESCO House, 1949), 23 pages. See also the Royal Society's *List of Periodicals and Bulletins Containing Abstracts Published in Great Britain* (London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1950), 79 pages, and the now quite dated Thomas R. Palfrey and Henry E. Coleman, Jr., *Guide to Bibliographies of Theses, United States and Canada* (Chicago, American Library Association, 1940), 54 pages.

they are accompanied by duplicate printers proof. That they are bound, labeled, look superficially like books, were accepted for degrees, and are being borrowed usually for scholars by libraries on inter-library loan makes no difference. It is plain that typewritten matter takes the first class rate.⁵ A *book* is defined as containing 24 pages or more, at least 22 of which are printed, "and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books." The book rate is eight cents for the first pound and four cents for additional pounds provided book parcels do not weigh over 70 pounds.⁶

Dissertations should be viewed as "books" for purposes of mailing. At present a booklet, pamphlet, or series of loose sheets reproduced in twenty copies or more is eligible for fourth class mailing privileges so long as it is mailed in bulk at the postal window. Dissertations are reproduced too, but only in five to seven copies by the use of carbon paper; yet they are increasingly the result of the mechanical stroke of an electric typewriter. They are bound in permanent form, and they carry no advertisements. They deserve some sort of cheaper rate.

The following proposed amendment to the postal laws and regulations would classify these volumes as "books" without letting commercial material in the door:

Typewritten manuscripts in permanent, sewn bindings, if bearing on their title page the statement that they were accepted for a degree by a college or university, shall be considered to be books and may be mailed at the book rate.

This change would aid scholars seeking new information in their fields and distribute the fruits of new research to places where it would do the most good.

Scholars who might be expected to show an interest in reading dissertations are widely distributed. This is demonstrated by a study in 1950 of the locations of the 146 universities which then offered Doctor of Philosophy "and equivalent degrees." According to the Office of Education the states with five or more such institutions were: New York 20, Pennsylvania 12, Illinois 10, Massachusetts 10, California 8, Colorado 5, Washington, D. C. 5, Ohio 5, and Texas 5. Although none were listed for Alabama, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Ne-

⁵ *Postal Laws and Regulations of the United States of America, Edition of 1948* [with revisions], order no. 42522 of Feb. 10, 1950, pasted on page 232.

⁶ *United States Official Postal Guide, July, 1951*, vol. 4, no. 1, sixth series, Part I, p. 34.

vada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, or Vermont, there are innumerable scholars in these states as in the others who are hurt financially and intellectually by present high mailing costs.

There is a postal deficit, of course. Changing the regulations would add to it, but the amount would be very small. The whole matter of postal laws has engaged the attention of two recent doctoral dissertations, and it may be that these studies will facilitate changes.⁷ It is urged that those interested write letters to their Senators and Representatives urging revisions in postal laws and regulations to make dissertations eligible for book rate mailing. It may well be that an administrative ruling will be sufficient on a matter as small and technical as this. If legislation should be needed, then Senators Fulbright and Morse, both former educators, should be asked to prepare a bill to provide an effective remedy.⁸ This would be Federal Aid to Education without strings.

Until postal rates can be changed, universities should pay the bill for the inter-library borrowing of dissertations for graduate students and faculty. Many do this already, for here is a practical way by which serious scholars can be given a sense of the seriousness with which their university officials view exhaustive effort in research.

VII

There is a better way of making dissertations available in the future than by forwarding the usual bound carbon copies. This new method, microfilm reproduction, was announced as an organized effort in 1938 when a slender pamphlet entitled *Microfilm Abstracts* appeared as Volume I in a series probably destined to supplant most of the abstracts issued today. It was the production of University Microfilms, a private organization located at Ann Arbor, Michigan, whose head, Mr. Eugene Power, had persuaded five universities to co-operate with

⁷ Robert D. Murphy, "Postal Control of Printed Information in the United States." Unpublished dissertation in Sociology, Syracuse, 1951. Irving Isaak Raines, "The Second-Class Postal Rate Controversy." Unpublished dissertation in Mass Communications, Illinois, 1952.

Dr. Raines contends in his abstract that the second-class mailing privilege constitutes a case of governmental control over magazines and newspapers, a power of life or death which keeps them from unorthodox viewpoints. It is hard to see in cheaper dissertation and library book mailing, however, any such danger.

⁸ Such a bill might well include a provision for making national in scope the existing library book postal rate of four cents per pound which is currently legal only within state lines or inside the first, second, and third postal zones.

him. Seventeen dissertations were filmed in the trial run, and in the introduction to their printed abstracts it was stated:

With specialization of scholarship and consequent restriction of the potential market, the publication of scholarly material has become increasingly difficult, since our reproduction processes are designed to produce a large number of copies economically, but are extremely expensive when only a small number of copies are needed.

This point is even more true today. *Microfilm Abstracts* in 1951 (Vol. XI) consisted of four book sized, paper bound issues containing 208, 269, 321, and 340 pages respectively and 71 pages of indices. Volume XII, it is said, will consist of six issues and has already been renamed *Dissertation Abstracts*.

Most academic disciplines were represented in 1951; there were, for example, 19 dissertations in Political Science, 55 in Chemistry, 162 in Education, and 47 in history. Many of the major universities were represented, and two institutions had special volumes of abstracts prepared for them from reprints.

What this microfilming project does and how it works may best be illustrated by a few examples. Speech dissertations are not easily printed at a profit. Yet the following microfilmed dissertations may be purchased by anyone: speech analyses of Senator George W. Norris (Michigan), \$7.95, Mark Twain (Missouri), \$2.80, President Rutherford B. Hayes (Michigan), \$4.13, and Speaker Champ Clark (Missouri), \$5.46.⁹ To show what these prepaid purchase prices mean, a dissertation recently shipped by express from Los Angeles to San Francisco cost three dollars roundtrip and had to be returned within two weeks.

It has become entirely too popular to make unflattering remarks about doctoral theses. These careless generalizations have hit the mark, so much so that the authors of three new books sent this writer for review in recent months concealed their Ph.D. dissertation origins completely. This practice would not have been necessary for self-protection a generation ago, and the difference is not entirely a change in

⁹ Also listed in *Microfilm Abstracts*, X and XI: "Religious Philosophies of Natural Scientists: A Study of the Published Credo's of Twentieth Century Americans" (Columbia, \$2.31), "The Churches and the Schools: American Protestantism and Popular Elementary Education" (Columbia, \$2.55), and "War, As Viewed By the Postwar Novelists of World Wars I and II" (N.Y.U., \$3.85). These titles were selected at random.

the quality of the product. It is the result of the attitude which mature scholars have repeatedly expressed toward the work of those graduate students whose failings, after all, may be traced in part to those very teachers.

The certainty of microfilm publication of a dissertation is going to have a salutary effect on graduate students and in itself will lead directly to better manuscripts. There can be no question that this will be true. Microfilm reproduction in lieu of some other form of publication should for this reason alone be made compulsory in every graduate school in the United States.

VIII

Fortunately, a Dissertation Publication Committee was named by the Association of Research Libraries at its meeting in July, 1951. The committee discussed in detail with University Microfilms officials the questions of microfilm reproduction and abstracts publication. The report prepared was approved by the parent body in Iowa City on January 26, 1952.

The Association of Research Libraries agreed on three basic principles: (1) All dissertations should be "published" in some sense of the word. (2) Microfilm publication is probably the answer to the problem pending possible book publication. (3) Abstracts and other guides must be made uniformly available "in one central bibliographical source."

It agreed that "the plan originated by Mr. Eugene Power providing for the preparation of master 35 mm. microfilm of the complete text of a dissertation, the publishing of an abstract in *Microfilm Abstracts*, and the supplying of positive microfilm reproductions from the master negative should be expanded."

Universities would not be put into straitjackets by the new plan, for alternative "levels" of participation have been provided. At one level a university would abolish its abstracts volume if it published one, inasmuch as 600 word maximum summaries would appear in *Dissertation Abstracts* (renamed since the Committee met). These universities would not lend out originals or carbon copies of dissertations approved after the plan went into effect. Instead, their dissertations would be microfilmed at Ann Arbor, and negatives would be stored there under proper conditions. Positive copies would be purchasable at a set rate; so far it has been 1¼ cents per page.

At other participation levels, universities have several alternatives: (A) They could continue to publish abstracts if they wish with their volumes indexed in *Dissertation Abstracts*. (B) They could do their own microfilming, forwarding negatives to Ann Arbor for storage and paying a fee for the publication of abstracts and other services. (C) They could do their own microfilming, retain the negatives, but make positive copies available for sale at their own rates on request. These, too, would be abstracted or indexed by University Microfilms, probably only the latter, however, for this plan would be used normally only when the original dissertation had been submitted in the form of a published book, article, or other mass reproduced form. A very small fee would be paid in these cases.

IX

Under these plans, who will pay, and how much? The question must be considered carefully, but costs will probably provide no serious obstacle. Until now the participating students have not only paid all of the fees demanded by their universities, but they have nearly always paid a standard \$20.00 each to University Microfilms in addition. They have received neither positive reproductions of the manuscript nor reprints of the abstract. Thus the twenty dollars has been an outright publication subsidy borne by doctoral candidates by themselves, and in the future, in the opinion of this writer, candidates should be entitled both to a positive copy and to several dozen reprints.

Since at the first level the \$20.00 fee will continue, it seems probable that universities, experiencing a saving by ending the abstract volumes overhead, and perhaps saving by binding fewer carbon copies, will be able to cut their graduation fees somewhat. They may then be able to shoulder some of the microfilming cost themselves, taking it if necessary from subsidies now paid to university presses. The latter have been turning increasingly chilly eyes on the publication of dissertations as such. The precise ratio by which expenses will be divided between universities and their students under the new program is a question to be settled locally. The Association of Research Libraries rightly maintained a discreet silence on the matter.

The universities, however, seem to have an obligation to bear part of this new financial load. There is no valid reason why doctoral candidates should sacrifice their personal solvency in order to create

their contributions to scholarship and then, in addition, be forced to carry the whole burden of distribution costs.

X

University Microfilms will continue to provide a copyrighting service for students desiring it at a cost of \$5.00 plus the price of the two positive copies which go to Washington. It may be a good idea for many students to obtain copyright of their work in the future, for the practice by which popular writers plagiarize manuscript dissertations is probably more widespread than has been generally known. One committee of scholars recommended that repositories of unpublished dissertations "adopt the Harvard rule of permitting no one to use these without permission of the author for a five-year period,"¹⁰ but if our aim is to *spread* knowledge, surely this period is excessive.

Universities will want to mark in typed dissertations the fact that they were microfilmed and/or copyrighted in order to provide that information to librarians and users alike. Failure to do so may lead to embarrassing complications—and force University Microfilms to raise its rates, if carbon copy loans undercut film sales.

XI

In summary, the following *action* is suggested for those administrators and faculty members who feel that the time has come to take positive measures to put dissertations in the hands of those best able to profit from them:

1. An appropriate university committee should check current practices on the physical preparation of doctoral dissertations: number of copies in the library, form and appearance, subsidization of inter-library loans of older dissertations, and cataloguing procedures. Footnotes must hereafter go at the bottoms of pages. It may also be a good idea to consider having doctoral candidates prepare detailed tables of contents or simple indices in the future to ease the load on readers of their microfilmed manuscripts.

2. A copy of the full report of the Dissertation Publication Committee can be obtained from Robert Miller, Executive Secretary, Association of Research Libraries, Indiana University; a summary by

¹⁰ "Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Manuscripts Set Up by the American Historical Association in December 1948," *American Archivist*, XIV (July, 1951), p. 240.

Ralph E. Ellsworth appeared in the *Journal of Higher Education*, XXIII (May, 1952), pp. 241-244. Universities may wish to finance the trial microfilming of one or more dissertations in order to familiarize themselves with the method and any problems involved.

3. Librarians should familiarize themselves with the A. R. L. plan and discuss the points raised here concerning it with faculty library committees.

4. One or more letters should be sent to appropriate legislators and to the Postmaster General asking that bound manuscripts submitted for degrees be classified as books and made eligible for book rate mailing. Something may come of it if enough of the right persons make the effort. As more and more dissertations appear on microfilm, of course, the need will diminish.

5. Informal committees should be appointed consisting of recent doctoral graduates and advanced graduate students. Such committees should be asked to consider the local dissertation picture from the viewpoint of students. Committee reports ought to be given thoughtful consideration by the faculty.

6. Those in a position to influence the policies of the major foundations should urge them to finance an annual volume listing doctoral dissertations in progress. Not the least of the virtues of such a compilation would be the picture it would give of trends in American education.

XII

By taking each of these steps one of the important unsolved problems in the graduate schools today—the *availability* of doctoral dissertations for actual use—will approach a solution. Thoughtful co-operation from those most concerned: administrators, teachers, librarians, and graduate students, will work wonders. Dissertation manuscripts which were prepared at great effort, thought, cost, and personal sacrifice, will finally enter the stream of scholarship. They will then become what they cannot truthfully be said to be now, that is, genuine contributions to knowledge.

Vocational Aspirations of Sophomores at North Carolina College: A Follow-Up Study

WILLIAM H. BROWN

INTRODUCTION

VOCATIONAL orientation is a basic motivation in the selection of a college program by those students who see advanced education as a planned step toward the achievement of economic security in a world of work. When a college regards vocational orientation as a common need for all citizens in a competitive economy, its General Education program should make definite provisions for helping students to discover and explore their vocational possibilities. Actually, the extent to which vocational orientation is achieved by students provides one index for the evaluation of college curricula.

In 1951, the Bureau of Educational Research at North Carolina College reported a study of vocational aspirations of Freshmen.¹ This study, undertaken as a service to the college, involved 343 students or 82 per cent of the freshman class of 1951. The study revealed that students tended strongly to aspire for those vocations to which high social prestige value is frequently attributed. Although no student listed education as a major and few listed it as a minor, teaching was revealed as the most prevalent and persistent choice when students were asked to list their first three vocational choices. Although sixty per cent of the students expressed considerable certainty about their chances to pursue their first vocational choices, their responses regarding what they needed in order to pursue these choices revealed powerful blocks that might easily prevent pursuit of these vocations. Their admitted need for help in discovering what they were able to do, their expressed need for broader opportunities to prepare for their chosen vocations, and their expressed need for more certainty about financial support of their education suggested that students tended either to overestimate the certainty in their vocational choices or to underestimate the power of deterrent factors.

¹ William H. Brown, "Vocational Aspirations of Freshmen," *COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY*, XXVII (January, 1952), pp. 206-218.

It was of interest to follow up this group of students after they had spent one year in college to determine the extent to which the apparent confusion about their vocational possibilities had been dispelled. Thus, the present study was undertaken to determine: (1) changes in the vocational preferences of the students, (2) changes in major and minor curriculum choices, (3) changes in the degree of certainty with which these students make vocational choices, and (4) the nature and persistence of needs which students recognize as blocks to the pursuit of their chosen vocations.

METHOD OF STUDY

The same questionnaire used in the freshman study was administered to those members of the group who returned to college as sophomores.² The questionnaire required students to indicate: (1) their first, second and third vocational choices, (2) the degree of certainty of their first vocational choice, (3) needs, which when fulfilled might clear the way for pursuit of chosen vocations, (4) their major and minor programs of study, and (5) kinds of vocational aptitude tests that they would like administered. The data obtained from this questionnaire were compared with those obtained in the freshman study.

DESCRIPTION OF SOPHOMORE SAMPLE

In the fall quarter 1951-52 only 232 of the 343 freshmen used in the previous study returned to school. Of those who returned, 30 failed to complete the questionnaire. Thus, the sample of 202 sophomores on which this study is based represents about 58 per cent of the sample used in the freshman study of 1950-51. That North Carolina College faces a serious problem of holding its freshmen can be inferred from the fact that 111 or 32.4 per cent of the 343 freshmen canvassed in the freshman study did not return to the college in the fall quarter of 1951-52. About a third of the 216 women and about a fourth of the 127 men used in the freshman study failed to return to college for various reasons. Information furnished by the college counselor revealed that 52 of these students were dropped for poor scholarship, 16 withdrew voluntarily before the end of their freshman year,

² Questionnaire adapted from form used by Robert Travers and Herman Niebuhr, "Vocational Choices of Freshman Attending the City Colleges," Research Publication No. 6, New York: College of the City of New York, Division of Teacher Education, 1950.

one was dropped for disciplinary reasons, one got married, one entered the army, and 40 withdrew for unknown reasons. The student mortality rate is obviously high for an institution whose undergraduate enrollment is 1233 students. The composition of the freshman and sophomore samples by major areas of study are given in Table 1.

By referring to the totals for the several major areas, it can be seen that commerce and biology enrolled the largest number of majors

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY MAJOR ACADEMIC AREAS REPRESENTED AND BY NUMBER AND PERCENT OF MEN AND WOMEN RESPONDING

College Major	Men			Women			Total		
	Number		Pct.	Number		Pct.	Number		Pct.
	1951	1952	1952	1951	1952	1952	1951	1952	1952
1 Commerce	16	7	8.7	50	30	24.6	66	37	18.3
2 Biology	34	26	32.5	16	11	9.0	50	37	18.3
3 Home Ec.				28	18	14.8	28	18	8.9
4 Soc. Sc.	13	4	5.0	27	11	9.0	40	15	7.4
5 Mathematics	9	8	10.0	13	7	5.7	22	15	7.4
6 Chemistry	17	7	8.7	8	4	3.3	25	11	5.4
7 English	2	1	1.3	16	10	8.2	18	11	5.4
8 Sociology				13	10	8.2	13	10	4.9
9 Physical Ed.	15	8	10.0	10	1	.9	25	9	4.5
10 Fine Arts	8	6	7.5	9	3	2.4	17	9	4.5
11 For. Lang.	2	2	2.5	7	5	4.1	9	7	3.5
12 History	4	4	5.0	2	3	2.5	6	7	3.5
13 Health Ed.	5	3	3.8	6	3	2.5	11	6	3.0
14 Pol. Sci.		4	5.0					4	2.0
15 Nursery Ed.					2	1.6		2	1.0
16 Psychology					2	1.6		2	1.0
17 Undecided	2	0		11	2	1.6	13	2	1.0
Total	127	80	100.0	216	122	100.0	343	202	100.0

from both the freshman and sophomore samples, in spite of their losses of 44 and 26 per cent respectively over 1951. Fifty-six per cent losses were sustained by chemistry and physical education. It is significant that 85 per cent of the students who were undecided regarding a major area in 1951 had either dropped out of school or chosen a major area by 1952. Since gains in the number of majors are shown by very few areas, it appears that student mortality is largely responsible for the number of majors lost by departments. It appears, too, that the departments of history, French, and sociology tended to hold their majors, though their enrollments were relatively small. The

education, physics, and philosophy departments offer a major³ but these departments enrolled no majors from the sample used in the freshman and sophomore studies.

CHANGES IN CHOICES OF MAJORS AND MINORS

It was of interest to determine how persistent the students were in their choices of majors and minors. The number of shifts in major areas between 1951 and 1952 are shown in Table 2.

The most outstanding feature of Table 2 is the fact that only 35 of the 202 students in the sophomore sample changed their majors. The stability of choices of major areas for this group may be represented as about 82 per cent. These results give further evidence that

TABLE 2
SHIFTS IN CHOICE OF MAJOR AREA BY NUMBER OF STUDENTS

From	To ^a																	Total Lost
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
1 Undecided			1	3	1		1										1	7
2 Chemistry				1	1	1	3											6
3 English				2			1						1					4
4 Commerce						1		1	1									3
5 Math.			1		1											1		3
6 Soc. Sc.	1											1					1	3
7 Biology												1	1					2
8 Fine Arts				1					1									2
9 For. Lang.	1			1														2
10 Home Ec.														2				2
11 Phys. Ed.							1											1
12 Sociol.																		
13 Psychol.																		
14 Nursery Ed.																		
15 History																		
16 Pol. Sc.																		
17 Health Ed.																		
Total Gained	2	1	1	9	3	1	7	1	1			2	2	2	1	1	1	35

^a The numbers 1-17 refer to the subjects listed in the extreme left column.

student mortality is responsible for losses by the various departments. It appears that these students are fairly stable in their choices of majors. The table shows that the largest shifts were made from the undecided and chemistry groups and into commerce and biology.

Considerably more shifting took place in minors than in majors,

³ Annual Catalogue of North Carolina College at Durham, 1950-51, pp. 45-46.

for only 18 per cent of the students changed their major area between 1951 and 1952 while a 40 per cent shift in minors was observed. It is noteworthy that 28 students who were undecided as to a minor in 1951 selected one by 1952 but 14 students who chose minors in 1951 shifted into the undecided group by 1952. Education gained ten students as minors while chemistry gained seven. Physical education and social science lost eight and six students respectively. While the number of shifts from individual areas was relatively small, it is significant that 23 different minor areas either gained or lost students. The sharp contrast between the number of changes in minors and shifting of majors suggests that students are considerably more stable in their choices of majors than they are in choices of minors.

VOCATIONAL CHOICES

Changes in First Vocational Choices

How stable were the first vocational choices made by students in 1951? To answer this question the first choices made by the students in 1952 were compared with the choices listed by these same students in 1951. Three alternatives were open to students: (1) a student might list the same first choice in 1952 that he listed in 1951, (2) a student might elevate his second or third choice of 1951 to first choice for 1952, or (3) a student might list an entirely new vocation as his first choice. The percentages of students in the sophomore sample taking each alternative were selected as indexes to stability in choices. Data on changes in first choices between 1951 and 1952 are given in Table 3.

The table shows that 68 per cent of the total number of students in the sophomore sample made no change in their first choice between

TABLE 3
STABILITY OF FIRST VOCATIONAL CHOICES BY SEX, BY NUMBER
AND BY PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS TAKING EACH ALTERNATIVE
WITH RESPECT TO FIRST CHOICE IN 1952

Sex	The Sample	Same Choice 1951 and 1952		Elevated 2nd or 3rd		New Choice	
	No.	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Male	80	48	60	6	7.5	26	32.5
Female	122	89	73	17	13.9	16	13.1
Total	202	137	68	23	11.3	42	20.7

1951 and 1952. It may be said, then, that the sample of 202 students exhibited 68 per cent stability in first vocational choices. About 11 per cent of the total number of students elevated a second or third choice of 1951 to first choice in 1952. It may be assumed that the first choice made by these students in 1951 were no longer feasible as first choices, at least from the point of view of the individual student. Nearly 21 per cent of the sophomore sample selected an entirely new vocation as a first choice. This suggests that these students encountered some experience which convinced them that none of their choices of 1951 were as feasible as the new choice.

Table 3 indicates that the first choices of the female students were more stable than those of males; that females exhibited a stronger tendency than males to elevate a second or third choice to first place; and that males exhibited a strong tendency to select an entirely new first choice of vocation. While the data do not reveal explanations of these shifts, it is possible that counseling received by students revealed either the soundness or unsoundness of their first choices. It is possible, too, that the shifts were made by students with little or no guidance-information. In that case the new choice may be no more feasible for the student than previous choices. Further analysis of the number of shifts in the first vocational choice revealed least shifts in art, physical education and English and greatest shifts in chemistry, mathematics, and commerce. It should be clear that no virtue is being claimed for stability of vocational choice beyond the fact that the student's choice of a college program, particularly his major area of concentration, is frequently based on his vocational aspirations.

Classification of Vocations

The vocations listed by sophomores fell neatly into the same classifications as those listed by the students when they were freshmen. Practically all of the vocations listed could be classified in type as professional or semi-professional jobs to which individuals tend to assign high prestige value. In view of the fact that Negroes are concentrated in low paying occupations,⁴ it is reasonable that college students would aspire for jobs in the professional or semi-professional class.

⁴ Aaron Brown, "An Evaluation of the Accredited Secondary Schools for Negroes in the South." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Department of Education, 1943, p. 41.

Apparently these students assume that college work is one step in their preparation for high paying jobs.

The vocations chosen by students in their freshman and sophomore years are given in Table 4. The most outstanding feature of the table is the fact that teaching persists as the vocation preferred by the largest group of students. North Carolina College, a liberal arts college, does not offer a major in teaching *per se* but a student may elect to pursue courses in education required for teacher certification. Thus,

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF VOCATIONAL CHOICES EXPRESSED BY SOPHOMORES WITH THOSE THEY EXPRESSED AS FRESHMEN, BY OCCUPATIONS AND BY PERCENT OF SAMPLE EXPRESSING CHOICE

Vocation	First Choice		Second Choice		Third Choice	
	1951	1952	1951	1952	1951	1952
1 Teaching	44.6	43.6	39.9	31.7	21.8	19.3
2 Medical Professions	13.3	13.8	2.3	5.4		.5
3 Clerical	6.4	7.3	8.9	7.9		1.5
4 Social Work	2.3	6.8	2.9	4.5		2.0
5 Library	3.6	3.5	2.3	3.5		3.0
6 Lab. Technology	3.6	3.5	4.1	5.9		.5
7 Graduate School		3.5		3.5		2.0
8 Business	2.9	3.0	1.1	5.4		2.5
9 Nursing and P. Health	2.8	3.0	3.7	.5		3.0
10 Law	4.1	2.0		1.0		.5
11 Domestic Arts	2.3	1.5	4.4	4.9		1.5
12 Civil Service		4.0		3.5		3.5
13 Field Unrelated to major			11.3		11.9	
14 Miscellaneous	14.1	4.5	6.6	5.0	17.6	2.0
15 Undecided			12.5	17.3	48.7	58.2
Total (Base)	100.0 (343)	100.0 (202)	100.0 (343)	100.0 (202)	100.0 (343)	100.0 (202)

a student who wishes to teach normally completes the General Education program, a major in a subject matter field, a minor in a second subject matter field, and elects such courses as he needs for teacher certification. Teaching positions are not only readily available to the Negro college graduate but also afford beginning salaries that are higher than those afforded by other jobs immediately available to the Negro college graduate.

Table 4 shows only negligible changes between 1951 and 1952 in the first vocational choices of the students. Evidently, these students are firmly set on entering their first choice of vocation as far as circumstances permit. Those teachers who deliberately and sincerely

clarify the relation between what the student is learning and his preferred vocation have no doubt discovered a powerful tool for motivating the learning activities of students. It is significant that in the sophomore year these students seem to have developed more indecision about a second and third choice of vocation. Nearly a fifth of the sophomores expressed no second choice and more than half of this group expressed no third choice. Whether or not this amount of indecision may become a source of frustration for students will depend largely on the amount of certainty that students have regarding their chances for pursuing their first choices of vocations.

CERTAINTY OF FIRST CHOICES

The degree of certainty in the first vocational choices of students was determined according to the following scale of student responses (1) the student was practically certain that he would pursue his first choice of vocation, (2) something stood in the way but the student was reasonably certain that he would pursue his first choice, (3) many things stood in the way, so his first choice was somewhat tentative, and (4) the student was very uncertain about his possibilities for pursuing his chosen vocation. The results of the certainty responses for 1951 and 1952 are given in Table 5.

TABLE 5
CERTAINTY OF FIRST VOCATIONAL CHOICE OF FRESHMEN AND SOPHOMORES BY NUMBER AND BY PERCENT OF EACH SAMPLE

Degree of Certainty	Per cent of Groups Responding					
	1951			1952		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Certain	25.2	25.4	25.4	43.8	41.0	42.1
Reasonably certain	37.0	32.4	34.0	28.8	27.9	28.2
Tentative	18.1	18.5	18.4	8.7	4.9	6.4
Uncertain	19.7	23.7	22.2	18.7	26.2	23.3
Total (Base)	100.0 (127)	100.0 (216)	100.0 (343)	100.0 (80)	100.0 (122)	100.0 (202)

The most outstanding feature of Table 5 is the sharp contrast between the proportion of freshmen and sophomores expressing certainty about their possibilities for pursuing their first vocational choice. Forty-two per cent of the sophomores, as compared with 25

per cent of the freshmen, expressed certainty about pursuing their first vocational choice. It is noteworthy that this same increase in certainty is apparent in the responses of both males and females. The combined proportions of students whose responses were classified as certain or reasonably certain were about the same in 1952 as in the previous year. The facts suggest that a substantial number of students who were only reasonably certain about their first choices in 1951 became more certain by 1952. Further, the sharp decline in responses indicating tentativeness of first choice, and the fairly stable figure for uncertainty, suggest that students whose choices were tentative became more certain about their first choices.

The sharp increase in certainty observed above is rendered more spectacular by the fact that 20.4 per cent of the freshmen who expressed certainty or reasonable certainty about their first choices of vocation did not return to school while only 12.2 per cent of those who regarded their choices as tentative or uncertain failed to return to school. Since a substantial number of the freshmen who expressed certainty about their choices dropped out of school, the observed increase in certainty suggests that a substantial number of students were more certain by the time they became sophomores.

FACTORS REGULATING DEGREE OF CERTAINTY

It should be recalled that the freshman sample was notoriously inaccurate either in its estimate of certainty or in its estimate of the importance of blocks to pursuit of a chosen vocation. The high drop-out rate, especially of those students who expressed certainty about pursuing their first vocational choices, suggests that unforeseen circumstances can interrupt a student's education. That these college students face a formidable crisis in continuing their education is quite apparent, unless a sizable majority of the drop-outs entered another college. As in their freshman year, the sophomore students were asked to indicate factors which in their judgment presented blocks to the pursuit of their preferred vocation. The responses of the freshman and sophomore groups are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6 shows that 27.6 per cent of the responses in 1951 called attention to finances as a block to pursuit of preferred vocations and that by 1952 finances comprised 39.9 per cent of the responses. It is reasonable to assume that a significant number of the freshmen who dropped out of school did so because of lack of financial support. The

TABLE 6
BLOCKS TO PURSUIT OF FIRST VOCATIONAL CHOICE INDICATED BY
FRESHMAN AND SOPHOMORE SAMPLES, BY NUMBER AND BY PERCENT
OF TOTAL RESPONSES EXPRESSING EACH DIFFICULTY

Blocks	1951		1952	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Finances	153	27.6	83	39.9
Parental Encouragement	24	4.4	13	6.3
Opportunities To Prepare	165	29.8	62	29.8
Knowledge of Aptitudes	211	38.2	37	17.8
None			13	6.2
Total Responses	553	100.0	208	100.0

apparent increased sensitivity of students to finances as a factor in continuing their education suggests that these students are finding it increasingly difficult to finance their education. This is expected in view of the rising cost of living and of public education. The slight rise in importance of parental encouragement as a factor regulating the student's chances for pursuing his chosen vocation is significant, if one considers the financial status of a family as a crucial matter in parental encouragement of education. Broader opportunities to prepare for chosen vocations seems to persist as a block to which students are sensitive, since both freshmen and sophomores placed 29.8 per cent of their respective responses in this category.

Knowledge of aptitudes accounted for 38.2 per cent of the total responses in 1951 but for only 17.8 per cent of the responses in 1952. Closer examination of the responses for the two years indicated that the drop-outs, more than those who returned to college, expressed concern in 1951 about their aptitudes. Obviously, the College has no opportunity to assist the drop-outs with the discovery of their aptitudes but it can forestall the possibility of further drop-outs by helping students who are enrolled to gain a clearer knowledge of their potentialities. It is possible that many students are already obtaining this information incidentally in classes as they discover the extent to which they are successful in meeting class requirements. Whether or not this is the most appropriate and reliable means of helping students to discover their vocational aptitudes is a question for the college faculty to decide.

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF REQUESTS BY STUDENTS FOR APTITUDE TESTS BY
MAJOR AREAS, BY NUMBER, AND BY TYPE OF TEST WANTED

Majors	Number of Persons Wanting Aptitude Tests						
	Mechan- ical	Sales	Clerical	Compu- tational	Scien- tific	Personal- Social	None
1 Mathematics	5	2	3	7	7	6	2
2 Commerce	4	9	22	6	2	17	7
3 Biology	4	1	4	2	33	14	4
4 Social Sci.		1	2	2	2	12	2
5 Phys. Ed.	2				2	5	3
6 Chemistry	1				7	7	2
7 Home Economics	3	2		3	5	15	2
8 Music	1				3	3	2
9 For. Lang.	1	1	1	1	1	5	2
10 English	1	2	2	2		10	1
11 Health Ed.	1	1	1		2	3	1
12 Art	1						
13 Nursery Sc. Ed.						2	
14 Psychology				2		2	
15 History						4	3
16 Sociology	1	1	2	1	1	9	
17 Pol. Science					1	4	
18 Undecided	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	26	21	38	27	67	119	32

STUDENT REQUESTS FOR APTITUDE TESTS

The interest of students in aptitude tests may be gleaned from their responses when they were asked to check the types of tests they would like to take, if arrangements could be made for them to do so. These responses are summarized in Table 7.

The table shows that all save 32 of the 202 sophomores indicated a desire to take one or more aptitude tests. This may be taken to mean that the students are very sincere in their expressed desire to learn more about their individual aptitudes. In general, the table shows that students selected tests which seemed to have some bearing on their major areas or on their chosen vocation. It is noteworthy that 119 students or almost 60 per cent of the sample expressed interest in a test of personal-social aptitude. This may be taken to mean that students regard skill in this area as important in the pursuit of their life's work and that considerable value is attached to knowledge of their potentialities in this area. Fairly reliable tests are available in all of these areas.

SUMMARY

This study was undertaken to discover what changes, if any, were made by a group of sophomores in responses to a vocational preference questionnaire administered to them when they were freshmen. The following conclusions seem to be justified by the analysis of the data presented above.

1. Commerce and biology continue to enroll the largest number of majors. In each of these areas, 18.3 per cent of the 202 sophomores were enrolled as majors.
2. The sophomores seemed quite stable in their choices of majors, since 82 per cent of them made no change in the choice of major they selected as freshmen.
3. Less stability was observed in choice of minor than in choice of major, since only 68 per cent of the sophomores had the same minor that they had as freshmen.
4. A stability of 68 per cent was observed in the first vocational choices of sophomores when their choices were compared with those made as freshmen.
5. The vocations preferred by both freshmen and sophomores fell neatly into professional and semi-professional classifications.
6. Teaching persists as the predominant choice of vocation with 43.6 per cent of the sophomores indicating teaching as their first choice of vocation.
7. The medical professions accounted for the first choices of 13 per cent of the sophomores.
8. Nearly a fifth of the sophomores expressed no second choice of vocation and nearly half expressed no third choice.
9. Certainty about possibilities for pursuing first choice of vocation increased from 25.4 per cent in the freshman year to 42.1 per cent in the sophomore year.
10. Finances, opportunity to prepare, knowledge of aptitudes persisted as factors regulating the degree of certainty in the first choices of students.
11. A desire for specific aptitude tests was expressed by 84 per cent of the sophomores with 60 per cent expressing a desire for a test of personal-social aptitude.

Beyond the figures and the survey operations used in this study, it is possible to discern a familiar tragedy in education. Students enter college with the hope of obtaining an education that will aid them in discovering what they are able to do in a world of work. The number

entering college is already pitifully small but the number remaining in college is even smaller. Many of these who are financially able to pay the costs of education seem unable to meet college standards of scholarship. Many of those who seem able to meet college standards are unable financially to remain in college. The tragedy is in the vast wastage of human resources occasioned by the apparent failure of colleges and students to adjust to each other. In view of the impoverished cultural environment from which the majority of these students come, it is unfortunate that curricula have not been designed to provide needed cultural experiences, opportunities to study one's own potentialities, and more than a gambler's chance to learn how to learn. College graduation and degrees must be regarded as irrelevant to such curricula, since success in college does not always indicate that the student has enjoyed these opportunities. It is unfortunate that the elimination process clearly evident in education manages somehow consistently to eliminate a large segment of youth who need most to continue in school.

The apparent need among the students who were the objects of this study can be met as they are retained in school, as they are assisted in discovering what they are able to do, as they are helped to discover and take advantage of broader opportunities to prepare for useful lives, and as they are helped to see their responsibility for contributing through their own efforts to the cost of their education.

The New York State University Scholarship Examination as a Prognostic Index of College Success

SHERMAN N. TINKELMAN

IN 1913 the State of New York established 750 University Scholarships, each paying an annual stipend of \$100 for each of four years of undergraduate study in the approved colleges of the State. The University scholarship program has been increased and enlarged over the years so that there are now 1654 of these scholarships with an annual stipend of \$350 each. It is likely that the coming years will witness further expansion of the program. The Board of Regents proposed in 1944 that the needs of the youth of the State for educational opportunity in higher education would not be adequately served until 12,000 scholarships were ultimately made available—about one for every 10 secondary school graduates. In view of the wide scope of the scholarship program, present and contemplated, and its significance to society as an investment in leadership, it would seem important that the program should be the subject of continuing and searching analysis. How successful has New York State been in selecting students with outstanding promise for its scholarship awards?

In addition, it is interesting to consider whether the University Scholarship competition has a broader value in the field of guidance and counseling. Prediction of academic success in college remains an important problem for both the high school and the college. If relative standing in the scholarship competition bears a marked relationship to college success, a valuable supplementary index is available for the use of high school counselors and college officers.

Since 1944, scholarships have been awarded on the basis of a uniform comprehensive examination taken by all scholarship candidates. The examination, largely objective in nature, is administered in 1½ days in the spring of the senior year. It samples the outcomes of instruction in the core-curriculum of the secondary school (Grades 7-12) required of all students, in proportion to the weight of the core subjects in the total core-curriculum of these grades. Included

in the core-curriculum are English, citizenship, science, mathematics, health, art and music. The questions are based not only on prescribed content but on knowledge and skills which a well-informed and alert twelfth-grader should have acquired as an outgrowth of studying the core-curriculum subjects.

Findley¹ in 1943 reported an investigation of the validity of an experimental form of this scholarship examination administered in 1940. He correlated test scores and first year college grades for 878 men and women in 8 different colleges. The range of correlations in 13 groups homogeneous with respect to college attended and sex was .29 to .68, with a median of .49. There has been no similar study of any form of the examination which has actually served as an instrument for awarding scholarships. Nor has there been any direct comparison of scholarship winners selected on the basis of a scholarship examination with candidates failing to win scholarships.

For these reasons, a follow-up study was undertaken on a number of scholarship candidates in 1949. Approximately 15,000 high school seniors in New York State took the scholarship examination that year, or about 12 per cent of the total senior class enrollment. Analysis was made of the first-year college grades of those candidates who were subsequently admitted to six New York State colleges, each of which annually enrolls a fairly large number of scholarship winners. Three institutions were selected in the New York City area—Brooklyn College, Columbia University, and New York University. The other three were upstate institutions—Cornell University, University of Rochester, and Syracuse University.

Any attempt to compare scholarship winners with unsuccessful scholarship candidates must take into consideration two important factors. First is the fact that the scholarship is awarded on a county basis. Each of the 61 counties in the State is allotted 10 scholarships for each assembly district therein. A non-scholarship winner in one county, therefore, may have a higher scholarship score than a winner in another county where the competition is less severe. The second factor requiring control is the college attended. Since colleges may differ in quality of student body or in grading standards, a scholarship winner at one college may achieve a lower college average than a non-winner at another college at which the competition may be less

¹ Warren G. Findley. "The Validity of a Comprehensive Examination for Scholarship Awards in New York State." *Journal of Experimental Education*, 2:250-6. 1943.

severe. Hence, it is necessary to compare scholarship winners with non-winners residing in the same county and attending the same college. In addition, to reduce the possible effects of differences in standards among the different courses of study at the same college, it seemed desirable to delimit the study further to students enrolled for a liberal arts degree.

Each of the six institutions furnished a list of its 1949 freshman class members who were residents of New York State and who were enrolled for the liberal arts degree. These lists were checked against the Education Department files to determine which students competed for the University Scholarship in 1949. At each college, a scholarship winner was paired with an unsuccessful competitor who resided in the same county. The pairing was performed arbitrarily, each winner being paired with the first non-winner in alphabetical order in that county. Those students who could not be paired were eliminated from further consideration.

Letter grades for each student were obtained from the colleges and, to obtain a general average, these letter grades were converted into numerical grades according to the following scale: A = 95, B = 85, C = 75, D = 65, F = 55. Each grade was multiplied by the total number of credit hours earned with that grade and a weighted average was obtained for each student.

Table 1 presents the average college grades of paired winners and non-winners at each of the six institutions. At each college, winners surpassed non-winners by an amount greater than could reasonably be attributed to random errors of sampling. The average college

TABLE 1
FIRST YEAR COLLEGE AVERAGES OF 1949 UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP
WINNERS AND NON-WINNERS, PAIRED BY COUNTY RESIDENCE

College	No. of Pairs	First Year College Averages			t
		Winners	Non-Winners	Difference	
A	27	85.7	81.3	4.4	2.9
B	83	87.8	82.9	4.9	7.0
C	74	80.6	76.8	3.8	4.2
D	65	87.7	79.6	8.1	7.4
E	37	84.9	77.1	7.8	6.5
F	22	87.4	80.3	7.1	6.4
All Colleges	308	85.5	79.7	5.8	14.5

grade for paired winners at all six colleges was 85.5 per cent, as compared with 79.7 per cent for non-winners. This represents an advantage in favor of scholarship winners of 5.8 percentage points.

The superiority of the scholarship winners gains additional significance from the fact that the non-winners with whom they are compared constitute a select group in comparison with all unsuccessful scholarship candidates. The non-winners in this study showed sufficient academic promise to be admitted by the colleges. Had all unsuccessful scholarship candidates been admitted to college, the superiority of the winners would probably have been even more marked.

The University Scholarship Examination would therefore seem to be a valid instrument for its purpose in the sense that scholarship winners surpass unsuccessful scholarship candidates in first year college achievement. If the examination is to have general value as a prognostic index of probable success in college, however, there should also be a high degree of correlation between scholarship test score and college grades for all candidates.

Unfortunately, complete scholarship test scores are not available for all candidates. The examination includes an essay section, which is rated only for candidates who achieve relatively high scores in the objective section. In order to obtain some measure of the relationship between scholarship test score and college grades, the correlation was found for scholarship winners alone. Narrow constriction of range in scholarship test score among scholarship winners operates, of course, to attenuate the correlation sharply, so that correction is necessary to estimate the size of the correlation in the unrestricted population.

Table 2 presents the correlations between total examination score and college grades for all scholarship winners, paired and unpaired, in each of the six colleges. It will be observed that the individual school correlations vary from .10 to .45. When analysis of covariance is applied, it is found that the correlation "within" colleges is .33. This may be interpreted as the correlation when the data from the six colleges are pooled so as to eliminate differences in mean scholarship score and in mean college average.

The correlation of .33 is an index of the degree of relationship between the scholarship test scores of scholarship winners and their first year college grades. A higher degree of correlation may be ex-

pected in the total population of scholarship candidates. The standard deviation of test scores in the pooled group of scholarship winners was 25. The standard deviation of test scores in the total population of scholarship candidates can be estimated to be about 50.² Applying the correction for curtailment suggested by Thorndike,³ it can be esti-

TABLE 2
CORRELATION BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP TEST SCORE AND FIRST YEAR
COLLEGE GRADES FOR 464 SCHOLARSHIP WINNERS IN SIX COLLEGES

College	N	Scholarship Test Score		College Grades		r
		Mean	σ	Mean	σ	
A	67	214.0	17.4	85.8	6.2	.33
B	80	229.0	28.2	88.2	4.3	.45
C	150	218.2	26.2	80.3	6.2	.37
D	66	218.1	18.6	87.4	5.5	.37
E	72	205.3	22.9	84.8	5.8	.25
F	29	194.3	39.0	86.6	6.0	.10
Within Colleges*	464	216.0	25.0	84.6	5.8	.33 ^b

* "Within Colleges" data obtained by analysis of covariance, thus eliminating differences among colleges in mean scholarship test score and mean college grades.

^b When corrected for constriction in scholarship test score, r becomes .57. (The standard deviation in the unselected population is approximately 50.)

imated that the correlation between scholarship test score and first year college grades in the general population of scholarship candidates is probably about .57. This figure compares favorably with the median correlation of .49 reported by Findley for the 1940 experimental test. It should be noted, however, that Findley's population was also somewhat curtailed in the sense that he included only scholarship candidates actually admitted to college.

At any rate, the correlation between scholarship test score and college achievement would seem to be sufficiently high for the general population of scholarship candidates to suggest that scholarship test score may have definite supplementary value both to the secondary school guidance counselor and to the college admissions officer. Towards that end, however, consideration needs to be given to reporting the test scores in standard score form so that they can be readily interpreted.

² Random samples of 740 papers each on parallel examinations in 1950 and in 1951 yielded standard deviations of 52 and 48, respectively.

³ Robert L. Thorndike, *Personnel Selection: Test and Measurement Techniques*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.

Discrimination in College Opportunities and Admissions: A Critique of Two Publications of the American Council on Education

FRANK K. SHUTTLEWORTH

I. INTRODUCTION

1. My interest in taking a critical look at the evidence of discrimination in college opportunities and admissions as reported in two publications of the American Council on Education grows out of thirteen years of psychological counseling at The City College. The great majority of our students are Jewish. My job makes me more sensitive than most to the evils of anti-Semitic discrimination. It is my observation also that an unrealistic fear of discrimination is often more damaging to the personality development of Jewish youth than the actual fact of discrimination.¹ I am therefore inclined to be critical of statistics which seem to present an exaggerated and untrue picture of the amount of discrimination which Jewish youth must face.

2. The Council's studies of discrimination were sponsored by a distinguished committee of educators headed by Professor Floyd W. Reeves of the University of Chicago. The basic data were collected and analyzed by the Elmo Roper organization under the direction of Dr. Julian L. Woodward. Dr. Raymond Franzen served as statistical consultant. The studies were financed by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

3. The relevant publications of the Council are as follows:

"Factors Affecting the Admission of High School Seniors to College: A Report by Elmo Roper for the Committee on A Study of Discrimination in College Admissions." 1949. Mimeographed, 58 pages of text plus a 315-page appendix of statistical tables. I shall refer to this as the Roper report.

"On Getting Into College, A Study of Discrimination in College Admissions," by Helen E. Davis. 1949. Pp. 99. I shall refer to this as the Davis report.

¹For an eloquent exposition of this point of view see "How Arm Our Children Against Anti-Semitism?" by Bruno Bettelheim in the September 1951 issue of *Commentary*, pages 209-218, published by the American Jewish Committee.

4. The nature of the data collected under the Council's sponsorship should be noted. A highly representative nationwide sample of 10,063 white high school seniors was personally interviewed in May of 1947. Data were collected in respect to sex, age, high school grades, socio-economic backgrounds, religion, etc. The college applicants among these seniors were asked to name the college or colleges to which they had applied and to indicate for each application whether it had been accepted or rejected or was still pending. A re-check of the still-pending applications was made the following September. This interview material yields three sets of data. There are data on 10,063 seniors. Among these seniors there are 3503 applicants for college admission. The 3503 applicants filed 5025 applications for college admission. The intensive analysis of these data centered on the northeastern section of the United States (New England and the Middle Atlantic States) where the Jewish population is most heavily concentrated and where college opportunities are most limited. In addition to the national sample, similar data were collected for a big-city sample of 5490 seniors in cities of half a million or more population. Among these 5490 seniors are 2338 applicants who filled 3946 applications for college admission. The distinctions between the seniors, the applicants among the seniors, and the applications filed by the applicants must be kept clearly in mind.

5. Over a period of more than two years I have conducted a very large correspondence and have initiated a number of personal conferences concerning the findings derived from these data. In addition to this correspondence there are available four mimeographed statements, a letter by Dr. Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. and a very short article which appeared in the December 22, 1951 issue of *School and Society*.² The availability of these statements makes it possible in this article to ignore a large number of minor and irrelevant issues. It will be convenient to refer to three of the foregoing documents. The first is an 8300-word mimeographed critique of the Council's publications, dated December 4, 1950, which I distributed to the officers of the Council and to members of three committees of the Council. The second is a 2000-word mimeographed rejoinder to my critique

² Shuttleworth, Frank K., *Discrimination in College Opportunities and Admissions*. *School and Society*, 1951, 74, 398-402. By permission of the Editors of *School and Society*, about a fifth of the present article repeats (without identifying quotation marks) material from this earlier article.

by Helen E. Davis, Raymond Franzen, and Julian L. Woodward dated April 3, 1951. The third document, a letter of 1700 words by Dr. Cottrell, dated November 19, 1951 and addressed to President Arthur S. Adams of the Council, found every fault with my original critique. I shall refer to these documents as my original critique, the rejoinder, and the letter.

6. I have had good reasons for approaching this problem step by step: firstly, by correspondence and personal conferences; secondly, through a privately circulated critique; thirdly, by publishing a very brief article which studiously avoided any suggestion of criticism. Everyone must be aware that the issues carry a very heavy emotional tone. This is particularly true on the City College campus where, over the years, we have had a series of bitter personal conflicts and even student riots arising out of charges of anti-Semitism. I would not dare to come near this problem did I not feel quite secure in the affections of our largely Jewish student body. More importantly, I have been concerned to get a message to Jewish youth: i.e., that the Council's publications provide no evidence of anti-Semitic discrimination in college admissions policies. If this message is to be widely and generally believed, it has seemed to me essential that the Council itself should say so. The present article is my fourth major effort to achieve this objective. If I fail in this effort, I shall nevertheless achieve a most important secondary objective: i.e., future studies in this area will be more carefully executed and more objectively reported. I place the issues before the critical eyes of a jury which may not be large but which is highly competent and sufficiently interested to give close attention to the necessary details. The numbering of each paragraph will permit some cross referencing and facilitate any further rejoinder.

II. THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES OF THE SENIORS

7. *Preview of this critique.* Sections II, III, and IV are devoted to the presentation of the most relevant facts as far as they can be computed from the extensive 315-page appendix of the preliminary mimeographed Roper report. These facts are concerned respectively with the educational opportunities of the *seniors*, the educational opportunities of the *applicants*, and the evaluation of college admissions practices as tested by what happened to the *applications*. Save for data in the first sentence of paragraph 13, there is not a line of text in

the two publications of the Council referring to any of these basic data. That is, the Council's publications systematically withhold all but one of the most relevant facts. While we are establishing this first of six major sources of error in the Council's findings, we shall take a look in passing at examples of other sources of error. The six sources of error will be considered in Section V. Sections VI and VII present summaries and conclusions.

8. Both of the Council's publications present data and discuss the educational opportunities of the applicants. Both are completely silent concerning the educational opportunities of the *seniors*. A little arithmetic applied to tables in the appendix of the Roper report pages 3 and 128 shows that in the *national* sample 59.1 per cent of the Jewish seniors had the opportunity of a college education against only 31.8 per cent of the Protestant and only 20.3 per cent of the Catholic seniors. Or, the Jewish and non-Jewish proportions are 59.1 per cent to only 28.5 per cent. These differences reflect the fact that twice as many Jewish as non-Jewish seniors applied for college admission and the fact that Jewish applicants by filing more applications were more successful than the non-Jewish in gaining entrance to college.

9. Table 1 presents more detailed data by quintile levels of ability as measured by high school grades. These data have been computed from pages 3, 128, 130, 242, and 248 of the Roper appendix. Note that 84.3 per cent of the top quintile or top fifth of the Jewish seniors had the opportunity of a college education against only 51.5 per cent of the top quintile non-Jewish seniors. In the bottom quintile the comparable proportions are 27.9 per cent of the Jewish and only 11.2 per cent of the non-Jewish seniors.

10. No data are available in the appendix of the Roper report from which to compute comparable proportions for the *big-city* sample. It is clear, however, that Jewish seniors in this sample were also highly favored in their educational opportunities. This conclusion is derived from the following facts computed from pages 274 and 290 of the appendix of the Roper report: 63.5 per cent of the 1504 Jewish *seniors* and only 34.7 per cent of the 3986 non-Jewish seniors applied for college admission; the 955 Jewish and 1383 non-Jewish *applicants* filed on the average 2.04 and 1.52 applications respectively; 61.9 per cent of the 1945 Jewish and 61.9 per cent of the 2001 non-Jewish *applications* were accepted. I estimate that about 54 per cent

of the Jewish and only 27 per cent of the non-Jewish seniors in the big-city population had the opportunity of a college education. While we are here concerned with the seniors, it should be especially noted that the Council's publications make no reference to the figures for all applications where the proportions accepted are exactly alike.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF SENIORS INTERVIEWED, NUMBER ADMITTED TO COLLEGE, AND PERCENTAGE ADMITTED TO COLLEGE BY QUINTILE STANDING AND RELIGION

Quintile Standing	Number of Seniors Interviewed		Number Admitted to College		Percentage Admitted to College	
	Non-Jewish	Jewish	Non-Jewish	Jewish	Non-Jewish	Jewish
I	1998	153	1029	129	51.5	84.3
II	1959	131	661	79	33.7	60.3
III	2152	104	511	54	23.7	51.9
IV	1786	74	323	33	18.1	44.6
V	1486	68	166	19	11.2	27.9
No data	147	5	28	2	—	—
Totals	9528	535	2718	316	28.5	59.1

11. The facts are that the Jewish seniors were twice as well favored as the Protestant and three times as well favored as the Catholic seniors in respect to opportunities for a college education. These facts are essential to a balanced appraisal of the total situation. They are of prime importance in easing unrealistic fears of discrimination. It must be emphasized that the Jewish seniors have earned their larger opportunities. They have earned them by better study habits, by greater drive, by keener intellectual interests, and by a real love of learning. Their zeal for higher education leads a larger proportion to apply for college entrance. Their tradition and culture give them unusual aptitudes for college work.

12. There is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council calling the attention of the reader to the fact that twice as many Jewish as non-Jewish seniors had the opportunity of a college education. On the contrary the discussion in both publications is such as to convey the impression that Jewish seniors are only as successful, rather than twice as successful, as non-Jewish in getting into college. I quote the following from pages 72, 83, and 88 of the Davis report:

As repeatedly emphasized, top-quintile Jewish students certainly succeeded in getting into some college in 1947 as often as anybody else—

more often than did Catholic young people. What the above analysis amounts to, then, is this: Jewish boys and girls might not have got to college at all in many cases, if they had not made so determined an effort.

The fact that upper-quintile Jewish young people nevertheless got into college proportionately at least as often as Protestants, may be attributed to their notably greater effort and persistence often in the face of serious misgivings.

In conclusion, let us repeat that Jewish young people, in the national and urban samples, succeeded as well as anybody in gaining access to higher education in the fall of 1947.

There is nothing in the nearby context to warn even the careful reader that these statements do not relate to the seniors. The critical reader may infer that these statements were intended to cover the applicants, but, if so, the critical reader must conclude also that these are misleading statements in respect to the applicants. See paragraph 14. There is also involved in these quotes an oft repeated confusion between the seniors, the applicants, the applications. See paragraph 38.

III. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES OF THE APPLICANTS

13. In the *northeast* of the national sample 86.2 per cent of the 290 Jewish *applicants* and only 78.3 per cent of the 792 non-Jewish applicants received acceptances from one or more colleges. Jewish applicants were favored in their opportunities for a college education because they filed on the average 2.41 applications against only 1.66 applications filed by the non-Jewish applicants. No comparable data for the *big-city* sample can be computed, but it is clear that Jewish applicants in this sample were also favored in their educational opportunities. From pages 274 and 290 of the appendix of the Roper report I compute the following: 100 Jewish applicants filed 204 applications of which 61.9 per cent or 126 were accepted while 100 non-Jewish applicants filed only 152 applications of which 61.9 per cent or only 94 were accepted. I estimate that Jewish applicants in the *big-city* sample were favored by five to ten percentage points over the non-Jewish.

14. Both of the Council's publications cite the above data for the *northeast*. Nevertheless both, and especially the Davis report, give too much emphasis to the findings from the *national* sample as a whole: 88 per cent of the Protestant, 87 per cent of the Jewish, and

81 per cent of the Catholic applicants had the opportunity of a college education. These figures involve considerable distortion because the Jewish applicants are heavily concentrated in the northeast of the United States where college opportunities are most limited. It is these distorted data which are given emphasis in the misleading statements quoted in paragraph 12.

15. These distorted percentages for the national sample as a whole are further distorted in Figure 2 on page 63 of the Davis report. The horizontal bar representing the 88 per cent of the Protestant applicants who had the opportunity of a college education is drawn more than *twice* as long as the comparable bar representing the 87 per cent of the Jewish applicants who had the opportunity of a college education. This chart must be observed in order to appreciate the ingenuity of the artist who drew it.

16. We have already noted that there are no data in either text or appendix of the Council's publications on the applicants in the big-city sample. In Table 23 of the Davis report, however, there are data on the *successful* applicants in this sample. My original critique devoted 250 words to explaining what is involved here. Since my analysis was not challenged by either the rejoinder or the letter it is sufficient to quote my conclusions: "Table 23 selects and combines figures which are not comparable in such a way as to produce evidence of discrimination where there is none."

17. The facts concerning the *successful* applicants are the opposite of those suggested by Table 23. From pages 144 and 172 of the Roper appendix I compute the following for the *northeast* of the national sample. The 250 successful Jewish applicants received on the average 1.49 acceptances each while the 620 successful non-Jewish applicants received on the average only 1.29 acceptances each. That is, among the successful applicants the Jewish more frequently had a choice of two or more colleges. Comparable ratios cannot be computed for the big-city sample, but it is clear from the facts of paragraph 13 that a similar situation holds in that sample. There is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council referring to these facts.

18. Finally there is the repeated implication in the two reports that the Jewish applicants succeeded only in getting into second-rate inferior colleges. The first quotation in paragraph 12 in which the word "*some*" is italicized is typical. This is an erroneous implication. My

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS AND PER CENT ACCEPTED FOR GROUPS FILING ONE, TWO, THREE, FOUR, AND FIVE OR MORE APPLICATIONS BY RELIGION, SEX, QUINTILE LEVELS OF ABILITY IN THE NORTHEAST OF THE NATIONAL SAMPLE AND IN THE BIG-CITY SAMPLE

Group Filing	Applications of Males						Applications of Females						Equated Totals	
	QI		QII		QIII-V		QI		QII		QIII-V			
	J	N-J	J	N-J	J	N-J	J	N-J	J	N-J	J	N-J	J	N-J
Data from Northeast of the National Sample														
One Application	10	74	10	53	18	120	23	84	10	58	15	53	86	86
N Applications	90	90	60	66	67*	56	87	87	90	90	60	72	75.7	76.1
% Accepted														
Two Applications	28	80	18	36	56	126	54	74	32	38	24	36	212	212
N Applications	79*	68	72*	70	43	44	81*	72	72*	66	67*	47	67.0*	59.9
% Accepted														
Three Applications	18	42	27	33	33	75	33	51	15	18	33	24	150	150
N Applications	56	57	56*	39	45*	31	76*	63	60	61	55*	38	58.2*	46.7
% Accepted														
Four Applications	16	20	8	12	16	24	24	8	4	8	16	12	64	64
N Applications	44	80	50*	34	25	38	50	63	0	50	44*	42	38.0	52.5
% Accepted														
Five or More Applications	46	47	25	11	18	25	44	11	—	5	14	10	96	96
N Applications	30	66	36*	27	22*	8	32	64	—	80	21	30	28.5	46.6
% Accepted														
Data from the Big-city Sample														
One Application	37	111	38	91	90	231	84	157	42	97	74	142	365	365
N Applications	95*	83	82*	80	71*	58	94*	90	79	88	70	70	80.6*	76.1
% Accepted														
Two Applications	78	128	92	80	138	128	160	112	100	36	98	64	498	498
N Applications	76*	68	67*	55	53*	42	83*	76	69*	58	58*	53	67.4*	58.4
% Accepted														
Three Applications	60	63	45	63	99	84	135	66	63	27	57	33	315	315
N Applications	57	63	56*	40	49*	42	73*	67	65*	59	46	48	57.6*	53.0
% Accepted														
Four Applications	32	44	28	24	40	52	32	28	32	8	36	12	144	144
N Applications	38	48	50*	33	25	38	50	71	50	75	44*	25	39.8	46.8
% Accepted														
Five or More Applications	40	5	56	34	49	59	66	12	33	—	11	10	110	110
N Applications	40	60	23*	21	24	24	48*	25	24	—	45*	30	28.9*	25.4
% Accepted														

Equated Totals of the Two Samples

original critique recommended a special study of this problem and predicted that further studies would show that the Jewish applicants were more successful than the non-Jewish in getting into the big-prestige institutions. My analysis was not challenged by either the rejoinder or the letter.

IV. COLLEGE ADMISSIONS PRACTICES AND THE APPLICATION DATA

19. We turn now to the evaluation of college admission practices. Data concerning the *applicants* are not relevant because the groups are not comparable in respect to the number of applications filed. While no systematic data are available on the experience of comparable groups of Jewish and non-Jewish applicants who filed one, who filed two, who filed three, who filed four, and who filed five or more applications, Table 2 presents in some detail what happened to the *applications* of these several comparable groups of applicants. These data are taken from pages 272, 273, 288, and 289 of the appendix of the Roper report. There is not a line of text referring to the existence of these data in the two publications of the Council. In the upper half of Table 2 are data for the northeast of the national sample. In the lower half are data for the big-city sample. Data are reported separately for males and for females. Data for each sex are reported for the top quintile of ability as measured by high school grades (QI), for the second quintile (QII), for the third, fourth, and fifth quintiles combined (QIII-V), and separately for the Jewish (J) and non-Jewish (N-J) applications. The table reports the number of applications and the percentage of these accepted for a total of sixty comparisons. The starred items identify percentages which favor the Jewish applications. Each of the sixty comparisons holds constant the factors of sex, quintile standing, and number of applications filed. Holding constant the number of applications automatically holds constant the number of first choice applications, the number of second choice applications, etc.

20. The importance of holding constant sex and ability factors in Table 2 can be taken for granted. The importance of controlling the number of applications arises from two facts. First, in the total of the two samples 76.4 per cent, 63.3 per cent, 54.7 per cent, 44.6 per cent and 33.2 per cent respectively of the applications of those filing one, two, three, four, and five or more applications were accepted. Second, relatively twice as many non-Jewish as Jewish appli-

25.4
28.9*
30
45*
—
24
25
48*
24
24
21
23*
60
40
% Accepted

Equated Totals of the Two Samples

cations were single applications where acceptance rates were high, while relatively twice as many Jewish as non-Jewish applications were multiple applications (four or more) where acceptance rates are very low.

21. These facts require some explanatory comment. Part of the great difference in the acceptance rates of single and multiple applications results from the fact that the College Entrance Examination Board reported to admissions offices of the member colleges the number of applications and order of choice of each application for all applicants taking these examinations. The colleges which had more than enough well-qualified first-choice applications tended to give little consideration to second-choice applications and still less consideration to third- and lower-choice applications.

22. Second, the facts of paragraph 20 may result in part from the concentration of single applications on institutions with high acceptance rates (junior colleges, teachers colleges, agricultural colleges, and denominational colleges), and the concentration of multiple applications on the big-prestige non-sectarian institutions with low acceptance rates. Some confirmation of this suggestion is found in the following facts computed from page 51 of the appendix of the Roper report: the single applications are predominantly non-Jewish; in the national sample 61.1 per cent of all of their applications against only 23.0 per cent of the Jewish were sent to junior colleges, teachers colleges, agricultural colleges, denominational colleges, and unclassified colleges where acceptance rates are high. The multiple applications are predominantly Jewish; in the national sample 44.2 per cent of all of their applications against only 22.2 per cent of the non-Jewish were sent to the nonsectarian colleges where acceptance rates are low. These considerations suggest in turn that each of the sixty comparisons in Table 2 needs to be made separately for several different types of institutions. In the absence of control of this factor it must be apparent that the comparisons in Table 2 tend to overstate the amount of discrimination.

23. Given access to the original Hollerith cards a standard statistical procedure for summarizing all of these data would be to match individual Jewish and non-Jewish applications by sex, quintile position, number of applications filed, and first, second, third, etc., choices. We can obtain almost exactly the same results, indeed more precise results, by statistically matching or equating the groups, that

is, by weighting each of the 60 pairs of percentages by the smaller number of cases whether Jewish or non-Jewish available in each comparison. For 2040 statistically matched pairs of Jewish and non-Jewish applications in the two samples, the percentages accepted are 61.1 per cent and 57.4 per cent respectively. That is, the Jewish applications are favored by a margin of 3.7 percentage points. The difference is statistically reliable, i.e., two or more times as large as its standard error. (This is the criterion of reliability used in the Roper and Davis reports.) For 608 and 1432 statistically matched pairs of applications in the northeast and in the big-city samples the comparable margins favoring the Jewish applications are .9 and 4.9 percentage points respectively. In the big-city sample the difference is statistically reliable.

24. Examination of Table 2 shows that the comparisons involving one, two, and three applications are quite consistent in favoring the Jewish applications. Of 36 comparisons of this type 24 favor the Jewish applications, only eight favor the non-Jewish and four are tied. For 448 and 1178 statistically matched pairs of such applications in the northeast and in the big-city samples, Jewish applications are favored by 7.1 and 6.5 percentage points respectively. Both differences are statistically reliable. These data concern 66.4 per cent of all Jewish applications and 83.1 per cent of all the Jewish applicants in the northeast of the national sample. In the big-city sample they concern 76.1 per cent of all the Jewish applications and 89.3 per cent of all the Jewish applicants.

25. Contrariwise, examination of Table 2 shows that the comparisons involving four and five or more applications in the northeast suggest discrimination. I am of the opinion that these differences will evaporate when the data of Table 2 are separately analyzed by type of college. Until this is done it cannot be claimed that there is any evidence of discrimination. As the data stand it can only be claimed that the evidence suggests the possibility of discrimination against the applications of the very small minority of Jewish applicants in the northeast who filed four and five or more applications.

26. Contrary to the findings of the Council's publications there is no evidence here that admissions practices discriminate against first and second quintile Jewish applications. For 1230 statistically matched pairs of such applications in the two samples the Jewish applications are favored by a margin of 3.5 percentage points.

27. Contrary to the findings reported by the Council's publications there is no evidence here that first choice Jewish applications are subject to discrimination. All of the single applications are, of course, first choice applications. For 451 statistically matched pairs of single applications in the two samples the Jewish applications are favored by a margin of 3.6 percentage points. Half of the applications of those filing two applications are first choice. If it is assumed that the first choice Jewish applications among these are discriminated against by the smallest margin, calculation shows that their second choice applications based on 355 statistically matched pairs in the two samples are favored by 16.9 percentage points. Similar results follow from an analysis of the applications of those filing three applications. I predict that a further break-down of these data will show that the first choice applications of the two-thirds of the Jewish applicants who filed one, two, and three applications will be favored over the comparable first choice non-Jewish applications.

28. The rejoinder raises only two issues concerning the facts of Table 2. First, most of the discussion of these data in the rejoinder is concerned with the possibility that equal abilities within each quintile may not be compared. For example, single applications were filed by 23.2 per cent and 52.1 per cent of the first quintile Jewish and non-Jewish male applicants in the northeast. *If it is assumed* that these Jewish and non-Jewish applicants are the most able within the first quintile, their median percentile ability standings are 97.7 and 94.7 respectively. That is, each of the 60 comparisons contrasts the applications of more able Jewish with less able non-Jewish applicants. It happens, however, that the assumption is contrary to the facts. Averaging the two populations, the two sexes, and the two religious groups shows that the first, second, and third-to-fifth quintile applicants filed on the average 2.00, 1.85, and 1.80 applications respectively. Thus, the argument of the rejoinder in the light of the available facts suggests that the comparisons of Table 2 tend to be biased in the direction of exaggerating the amount of discrimination.

29. Second, a single sentence in the rejoinder seems to say that the data of Table 2 are not relevant because "application number is not of itself a factor in applicant's ability to do college work or an indication of any personality characteristics that a college should take account of." This statement is irrelevant for the facts of paragraph 20 which show that application number is a decisive factor in determining ap-

plication success. I am led to suggest that Table 2 tends to compare the applications of those who are equally confident, equally eager, equally fearful, equally willing to make the greater effort of filing more applications, equally satisfied with education in a small-prestige institution, and equally in search of education in a big-prestige institution. The need is for more rather than less control of the personality characteristics which are associated with application success.

30. While the *data* show very clearly that Jewish applications are rather consistently favored, it must not be concluded from this evidence that admissions practices actually did favor the Jewish applications. See paragraph 53.

V. SIX CRITICISMS OF THE COUNCIL'S PUBLICATIONS

31. For purposes of convenient exposition, I distinguish six major sources of error in the findings reported by the Council's publications. It should be especially noted that the evidence of discrimination as reported in these publications invariably involves the cumulative influence of at least three and often four and five of these errors operating together. The significance of each type of error should be judged in the larger context of the total complex of errors.

32. First, the Council's publications systematically withhold all but one of the highly relevant and critically important facts which we have been discussing in the preceding sections, paragraphs 7 to 30. That is, except for the data in the first sentence of paragraph 13, there is not a line of text in the Council's publications referring to any of the most relevant facts. In the one instance in which the basic facts are reported, the emphasis of the Davis report falls on other data which involve considerable distortion.

33. Second, all the evidence of discrimination as reported by the Council's publications is systematically exaggerated by the failure to control the factor of application number. When sex, quintile position, and application number are held constant as in Table 2, the Jewish applications in the northeast are favored by .9 percentage points. When these factors are not held constant the discriminatory margin against the Jewish applications is 7.0 percentage points. That is, failure to control these factors, and especially the factor of application number, consistently exaggerates all the evidence of discrimination by 7.9 percentage points in the northeast. The comparable all pervasive exaggeration in the big-city sample is 4.9 percentage points.

Using a different method of measuring this type of error, my original critique showed that in the two samples combined the distortion in the first and second quintiles averages 8.9 percentage points against only 5.2 percentage points in the third to fifth quintiles. That is, the finding of discrimination against the applications of the ablest Jewish applicants as reported in the Council's publications is an artifact of the greater amount of distortion at these levels of ability.

34. Third, all the evidence of discrimination as reported in the Council's publications is systematically exaggerated by the failure to take account of the concentration of Jewish applications on institutions with low acceptance rates. The most relevant data on this point concern the distribution of applications in the national sample according to several types of colleges reported on page 51 of the appendix of the Roper report. After minor adjustments of these data, the distributions of 100 non-Jewish and of 100 Jewish applications are as reported in the first two columns of the following tabulation.

To teachers colleges, junior colleges, denominational colleges, land grant colleges, and unclassified:	Distribution of		Assumed Acceptance Rates	Number of Acceptances in the Absence of Discrimination	
	100 Non-J Applicants	100 Jewish Applicants		Non-J	Jewish
To teachers colleges, junior colleges, denominational colleges, land grant colleges, and unclassified:	61.1	23.0	90%	55.0	20.7
To other public colleges:	16.7	32.8	70%	11.7	23.0
To nonsectarian private:	22.2	44.2	50%	11.1	22.1
Total acceptances:				77.8	65.8

Note that twice as many non-Jewish as Jewish applications go to teachers colleges, junior colleges, denominational colleges, and land grant colleges where the overall acceptance rates are high. Conversely, twice as many Jewish as non-Jewish applications go to other public colleges and to nonsectarian privately controlled colleges where the overall acceptance rates are low. I estimate (see page 189 of the appendix of the Roper report and the footnote to paragraph 45) that the acceptance rates for these three groups of colleges are roughly 90 per cent, 70 per cent, and 50 per cent as recorded in the third column above. Let us assume that the two religious groups are treated exactly alike. That is, in the first row of figures we take 90 per cent of 61.1 non-Jewish applications and 90 per cent of 23.0 Jewish applications giving 55.0 and 20.7 acceptances as reported in the two columns at the right. Nevertheless, when these columns are added, it appears that 77.8 per cent of the non-Jewish and only 65.8 per cent of the Jewish applications are accepted. Thus, faulty statistical

analysis by lumping together colleges with different acceptance rates produces evidence of discrimination in the total figures where our computations have insured that there is none. The estimated distortion amounts to 12.0 percentage points. All of the percentages of the Council are distorted by this type of error. Further, the distortion is doubtless greater among first and second quintile applications than among third to fifth quintile applications.

35. We have discussed two all-pervasive sources of error in the Council's statistics on discrimination: failure to control the factor of application number and failure to take account of the concentration of Jewish applications on institutions with low acceptance rates. These two sources of error tend to be additive. Every pair of percentages involving Jewish and non-Jewish applications as reported in the Council's publications reflects the cumulative influence of these two exaggerations working together.

36. Fourth, there is a consistent pattern of selective reporting in the two publications of the Council. My original critique devoted a whole section of 1400 words to the citation of such instances. Since none of these specific instances was challenged in either the rejoinder or the letter, I present here only instances drawn from the big-city sample. It must be kept in mind that every instance of selective reporting is superimposed on the cumulative effect of the two exaggerations which were discussed in paragraphs 33 and 34. Table IX on page XLVII of the Roper report presents an analysis of the *application* data by extra-curricular activities of the applicants, by nativity of parents of the applicants, by occupation and education of the fathers of the applicants, etc., etc. The table reports ten statistically reliable differences between Jewish and non-Jewish applications. It took me six months to discover that two of these differences *favor* the Jewish applications. The text fails to call attention to these exceptions. Nor does the text call attention to the fact that these ten differences were selected from over a hundred comparisons. Nor does the text call attention to the percentages for all the applications in the big-city sample which are exactly even. From among the eight apparent instances of discrimination, the Davis report, page 71, selects for citation only the percentages for the two most extreme instances. The data of my Table 2 show that the Jewish applications in the big-city sample are consistently favored by a statistically reliable margin of 4.9 percentage points. Nevertheless, selective reporting of selectively

reported and twice exaggerated data makes it possible for the Davis report to cite discriminatory margins of 15 and 20 percentage points.

37. Fifth, there is a consistent pattern of piling distortion on distortion. Consider the applications in the national sample. When sex, quintile position, and application number are controlled as in Table 2, Jewish applications in the northeast are favored by .9 percentage points. When these factors are not controlled the discriminatory margin against the Jewish applications in the northeast becomes 7.0 percentage points. When geographic area is also ignored, the discriminatory margin in the national sample as a whole becomes 18.4 percentage points. When Protestant and Jewish applications are considered the discriminatory margin becomes 21 percentage points. Finally, in Figure 2 on page 63 of the Davis report the vertical bar representing the 77 per cent of Protestant applications which were accepted is drawn *three* times as long as the comparable bar representing the 56 per cent of Jewish applications which were accepted. Figure 2 piles an obvious distortion upon the cumulative distortion of a series of distortions. See also paragraph 15.

38. Sixth, there is a consistent pattern of misleading discussion and interpretation. Several examples have been noted in paragraphs 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 32, 36, and 37. Both publications consistently confuse the seniors, the applicants, and the applications. The second and fourth sentences on page 69 of the Davis report are typical of many which discuss the findings concerning discrimination against *applications*. These sentences read as follows, italics mine:

Of the total number of 31 such cases, 22 occurred against first quintile Jewish *students*, 7 against *Jews* in the second quintile, and the remaining two against *Catholics* in the three lower quintiles. . . . But the highly significant aspect of the situation is that discrimination was exercised, in 1947, only against the most intelligent *seniors*.

The italicized misleading words are superimposed on selectively reported data which involve two exaggerations. Among many sentences to the same effect, there should have been at least one mention of the fact that these findings concern *applications*. Significantly enough the counter arguments in the rejoinder exhibit this same confusion. I quote the following from the second paragraph of the rejoinder, italics mine:

Let us first emphasize the fact that the Council's *two* documents *made only a very limited and carefully circumscribed charge of discrimination*

on the part of American colleges. "With some kinds of applicants who are applying to some kinds of institutions, and particularly to colleges outside the home town of the applicant, there is evidence (we said) that religion is important and that *Jews* especially are handicapped." We said also that, "with other applicants and particularly those from the South and West, the religion factor seems to be of negligible influence." And we concluded, "The frequent charge made against the colleges that they discriminate against Jewish students seems, then, to be proven but only in part and perhaps not nearly to the extent which is frequently charged."

In addition to the usual confusion, it should be noted that the source of the three quotations is not given. The reference to the "two" documents suggests that the quotes are from the two documents. This is not true. Since I quoted only from the Davis report it might be supposed that these quotes are from that document. This is not true. Note that there are three separate quotes suggesting that they were taken from three separate passages. This is not true. They are three consecutive sentences from page LIV of the preliminary mimeographed Roper report.

39. We turn now to much more serious misinterpretations which underlie one of the major conclusions of the Council's publications. These involve Table 25 which appears on page 77 of the Davis report. This table concerns the applications of first and second quintile Jewish and Protestant applicants in the big-city sample analyzed by location of the college to which their applications were sent, i.e., in the home city, in the home state but not city, and outside the home state. Apparently institutions within the home city did not discriminate while those outside of the home city did. I quote the following from the chapter conclusions which follow immediately on page 78. The italics are mine.

The prejudice emanated especially from colleges outside the student's home city, and the evidence points very strongly to *some* institutions under *nonsectarian* private control.

Very similar sentences appear on pages 82 and 87 of the concluding chapter attributing discrimination from colleges outside the applicant's home city to the *nonsectarian* institutions. In each instance these sentences make "only a very limited and carefully circumscribed charge of discrimination" by adding the qualifying words *some, some*—by no means all, *some*, and *few* to their references to *nonsectarian*

institutions. Throughout the text following the above quotation from page 78 there is no reference to *privately* controlled colleges.

40. Nevertheless, the text on pages 75 and 76 just prior to Table 25 refers to *privately* controlled colleges. The heading to Table 25 also refers to *privately* controlled colleges. Privately controlled colleges include, of course, both nonsectarian and denominational institutions. It required four letters to Dr. Woodward over a period of five months to verify this discrepancy and to ascertain the true facts about Table 25. On January 11, 1951 Dr. Woodward wrote very positively that the data concerned *privately* controlled colleges. Nevertheless, the rejoinder, dated April 3, 1951 cited Table 25 and referred to *nonsectarian* institutions. Finally, by telephone Dr. Woodward acknowledged that the rejoinder was in error and explained that applications sent both to privately controlled denominational colleges other than Catholic and to privately controlled nonsectarian colleges were involved.

41. I confirmed this conversation in a letter dated April 27, 1951 as follows: "I appreciate your telephone call of yesterday. I wish that you could be persuaded to see the distortion that is involved. From page 51 of the appendix of the original Roper report it appears that in the national sample (the big-city sample cannot be very different) the distribution of 100 Protestant and of 100 Jewish applications is as reported in the first two columns of the following tabulation:

Applications to privately controlled colleges	Distribution		Assumed acceptance rates which completely account for the evidence	Number of acceptances in the complete absence of discrimination	
	100 Prot. Applicants	100 Jewish Applicants		Prot.	Jewish
Denominational non-Catholic:	49	6	82.6%	40.5	5.0
Nonsectarian:	51	94	50.0%	25.5	47.0
Totals, per cent of applications accepted:				66.0	52.0

Let us assume acceptance rates of 82.6 per cent and of 50.0 per cent for the two groups of colleges and that the two religious groups are treated exactly alike. [That is, 82.6 per cent of 49 applications gives 40.5 acceptances and 82.6 per cent of 6 applications gives 5.0 acceptances.] In the complete absence of discrimination it results that 66 per cent of the Protestant and only 52 per cent of the Jewish applications are accepted. These percentages happen to be the precise figures reported for the totals of Table 25. I am of the opinion that the details

of Table 25 can be accounted for in a like manner. The foregoing, of course, does not prove that there is no discrimination here, it merely establishes that you have not proved the existence of any discrimination. To conclude from these figures that discrimination comes from the nonsectarian colleges simply does not follow."

42. Several points concerning Table 25 are quite clear. For months I was misled concerning the facts. The rejoinder misstated the facts. It has proved difficult to verify the facts. The evidence of discrimination in Table 25 involves a large element of distortion. Indeed, as everywhere, two distortions are involved. There is something more here than unsophisticated faulty analysis. Table 25 selects and combines data which are not comparable in such a way as to produce evidence of discrimination where there may be none. The conclusions drawn from this distorted evidence constitute an obvious non sequitur. The words *some, some—by no means all, some, and few* in the context of this non sequitur are highly misleading. Finally, the non sequitur and its associated misleading words occur in a larger context which includes withholding highly relevant data, two faulty statistical procedures exaggerating the evidence of discrimination, selective reporting of selectively reported data, a pattern of piling distortions on top of distortions, and other misleading interpretations.

VI. DISCUSSION, SUMMARIES, INTERPRETATION

43. *Introductory Considerations.* Before summarizing the evidence, attention needs to be given to three points which fall outside the scope of the data collected under the Council's sponsorship. First, the outlook for Jewish applications during the immediate future is far better than in the fall of 1947. College enrollments have declined and admissions officers are accepting a larger proportion of applications. The College Entrance Examination Board has abandoned the practice of reporting the number of applications and order of choice of each application for those who take these examinations. New York State has passed an Education Practices Act which forbids discrimination and bans from the application blanks of public and nonsectarian institutions all questions about race, religion, creed, color, or national origin.

44. Second, it must be noted that the most damaging educational discriminations in our society are not of the sort we have been discussing. Negroes are greatly handicapped educationally, but not because

college admissions officers discriminate against them. On the contrary, outside of the south, most college admissions officers at undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels give the Negro application much more than an even break. The facts are that a thousand factors conspire from the cradle to deprive the Negro child of intellectual stimulation, to discourage his educational aspirations, to impair the quality of his education, to hurry his leaving school, and in the end to cheat him of the fair rewards of his educational achievements. In a very different context, many of the same factors handicap white children from the lower economic levels and especially the lower social classes. In a typical Illinois city Hollingshead³ studied all the 735 high school age youth, sorting them by social class with the following results: of 193 middle and upper-class children 94.4 per cent were in school, of 312 upper-lower class children 58.7 per cent were in school, of 230 lower-lower class children only 11.3 per cent were in school. The bare facts are appalling enough, but the more disheartening aspect of this problem is that very few educators are even aware of the host of subtle discriminations which these facts reflect.

45. Third, reference should be made to other recent studies. The best of these is by Berkowitz⁴ who examined the problem in New York State as of 1946. This is a competently executed and objectively reported study, also under the general direction of Dr. Floyd W. Reeves. The great merit of Berkowitz's study is that it begins with *all* the applications sent to *each* of fourteen privately controlled nonsectarian liberal arts colleges. That is, his findings for these colleges are completely free from the distortion involved in lumping together institutions of all types and institutions with different acceptance rates. Among the fourteen colleges, five did not discriminate while nine apparently were discriminating. Seventeen other liberal arts nonsectarian colleges in the state did not ask questions about religion and presumably were not discriminating.

46. It is important to note that Berkowitz reports that discrimination falls most heavily on the applications of the least able Jewish

³ Hollingshead, August B., *Elmtown's Youth; the Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents*. New York: Wiley, 1949. Pp. 480.

⁴ Berkowitz, David S., "Inequality of Opportunity in Higher Education; A Study of Minority Group and Related Barriers to College Admission." A Report to the Temporary Commission on the Need for a State University. New York State Legislative Document, 1948, No. 33. Pp. 203. Berkowitz reports that 44.8% of over 12,000 applications sent to fourteen liberal arts nonsectarian colleges in up-state New York were accepted.

applicants while the Council's studies report the exact opposite. Nevertheless, it is categorically stated in the Davis report, page 87, that the two studies "completely corroborate one another to the extent that they cover the same subject." Berkowitz's findings are doubtless correct. The Council's findings are undoubtedly false. The claim of complete corroboration is clearly false.

47. The serious limitation of Berkowitz's study, perhaps understandable in the light of the data with which he worked, is that it does not control the factor of rank order of application choice. That is, his findings tend to compare Jewish applications involving a relatively large proportion of third, fourth, fifth, etc., choices which have low acceptance rates with non-Jewish applications involving a relatively large proportion of first choices which have high acceptance rates. Nor are the applications equated for sex differences or for differences in parental background of graduation or non-graduation from the institutions to which the applications were sent. It results that the discriminatory margins reported by Berkowitz are greatly exaggerated. However, even after generous allowances for these uncontrolled factors, it is highly probable that a few of the fourteen institutions which he studied were discriminating in 1946.

48. *Educational Opportunities.* The high school population of Jewish seniors was twice as well favored as the Protestant and three times as well favored as the Catholic in its opportunities for a college education. The larger opportunities of the Jewish seniors hold for both samples and for each quintile level. Their larger opportunities reflect the fact that they applied in larger numbers. There is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council referring to these facts. On the contrary the discussion in the Davis report suggests that Jewish seniors are only *as* favored, rather than twice as well favored, as the non-Jewish in their educational opportunities.

49. In the northeast the Jewish *applicants* by filing more applications were favored in their educational opportunities by a margin of 7.9 percentage points over the non-Jewish. A similar situation holds in the big-city sample. Both of the Council's publications report the facts for the northeast, but the emphasis of the discussion in the Davis report falls on the distorted data for the national sample as a whole. These distorted data are further distorted in Figure 2. There is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council referring to the facts in the big-city sample.

50. In the northeast the *successful* Jewish applicants received on

the average 1.49 acceptances each to only 1.29 acceptances each received by the successful non-Jewish applicants. That is, among the successful applicants the Jewish more frequently had a choice of two or more colleges. A similar situation holds in the big-city sample. There is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council referring to these facts. Instead, Table 23 of the Davis report by selecting and combining data which are not comparable produces evidence of discrimination against the successful Jewish applicants where there is none.

51. The foregoing conclusions say nothing about college admissions practices. They are relevant only for the larger problem of educational opportunities. The total situation, far from handicapping or limiting or discriminating against Jewish seniors or Jewish applicants or the successful Jewish applicants, was actually very favorable indeed.

52. *Admissions Practices.* When the factor of application number is held constant, the data collected by the Roper organization show that the applications of the Jewish applicants were favored by a small margin in the northeast of the national sample and by a statistically reliable margin in the big-city sample. The applications of the Jewish applicants who filed one, two, and three applications were favored over the non-Jewish by statistically reliable margins of 7.1 and 6.5 percentage points respectively in the northeast and in the big-city sample. These data concern the great majority of the Jewish applications and five out of six of the Jewish applicants in the two samples. The only evidence suggesting discrimination concerns the applications of the small minority of Jewish applicants in the northeast who filed four and five or more applications. These evidences of discrimination will probably vanish with a further break-down of the data by types of colleges. There is no evidence in the data that the applications of the ablest Jewish applicants in the first and second quintiles of ability are subject to discrimination. On the contrary, such applications were favored by a small margin. There is no evidence here that first choice Jewish applications are subject to discrimination. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that the first choice applications of the great majority of Jewish applicants (the five-sixths who filed one, two and three applications) were favored. An unequivocal negative conclusion is clearly indicated. There is no evidence whatever in the two publications of the Council that college-admissions practices in the fall of 1947 discriminated against the Jewish applications. Again it must be

stated that there is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council concerning the existence of the data which support the foregoing conclusions.

53. While the *data* show that the Jewish applications are rather consistently favored, it cannot be concluded that college admissions practices actually did favor the Jewish applications. Such a conclusion seems to me inherently improbable. I am led to suspect, instead, that there may be something wrong with the *data*. My original critique devoted considerable space to a theory in explanation. The Roper data classified all seniors by quintiles within particular high schools but made no adjustment as between high schools. I suspect that the Jewish seniors are heavily concentrated in the better high schools. If so, their quintile positions are systematically understated. If so, comparisons controlling quintile levels and other factors tend to show that the Jewish applications are favored. However, this explanation of the findings was rejected by the rejoinder.

54. *Sources of Error in the Council's Publications.* The Council's publications systematically withhold all but one of the most relevant facts concerning educational opportunities and admissions practices. All the evidence of discrimination is consistently exaggerated by statistical procedures which fail to control the factor of application number and which fail to take account of the concentration of Jewish applications on institutions with low acceptance rates. Beginning with data which include these two all-pervasive exaggerations, there is a consistent pattern of selective reporting and a consistent pattern of piling further distortions on top of distortions. There is a consistent pattern of misleading discussion and interpretation of the exaggerated, selectively reported, and distorted evidence.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

55. The educational opportunities of the Jewish seniors, of the Jewish applicants, and of the successful Jewish applicants compared very favorably indeed with the opportunities of the comparable non-Jewish groups. There is no evidence whatever in the two publications of the Council that college admissions practices in the fall of 1947 discriminated against the Jewish applications. These conclusions are derived from data in the appendix of one of the Council's publications. Save for data in the first sentence of paragraph 13, there is not a line of text in the two publications of the Council referring to the

extensive data which support the foregoing conclusions.

56. In its eagerness to win the battle against discrimination, the Council's Committee on Discrimination has approved the systematic withholding of highly relevant data, faulty statistical procedures which exaggerate the evidence of discrimination, a selective reporting of this exaggerated evidence, further distortions, and misleading interpretations of exaggerated, selectively reported, and distorted evidence.

57. In its eagerness, the Council's Committee on Discrimination has needlessly injured the good reputation of our institutions of higher education. Unfounded charges that admissions policies are unfair and undemocratic are themselves unfair and undemocratic. We in America greatly need a more righteous horror of discrimination. We need also an equally righteous horror of baseless accusations of anti-Semitic discrimination. In its eagerness, the Committee has forgotten that the battle against discrimination must be fought on two fronts. The first battle is against discrimination itself. The second battle is against an unrealistic fear of discrimination which in many instances is damaging to the personality development of Jewish youth. To exaggerate and aggravate the fear and expectation of discrimination seems to me to be very, very bad indeed.

58. The scientific integrity of the Council, mere fairness to colleges and their admissions officers, and the welfare of Jewish youth require that the Council repudiate the findings of the Roper and Davis reports.

59. Postscript. This article was accepted for publication with the understanding that space would be provided in the same issue for a rejoinder. On May 16, 1952, President Arthur S. Adams of the Council wrote that there were no plans for the preparation of such a rejoinder.

Canadian Universities Get Federal Aid

EDWARD F. SHEFFIELD

EARLY in 1952, the federal government of Canada wrote a new chapter in Canadian constitutional history by making unrestricted grants totalling \$7,000,000 to its 155 colleges and universities. This worked out to an average of close to \$125 for each full-time undergraduate and graduate student enrolled for the academic year 1951-52. Few university administrators seem to be worried about the bogey of federal control.

Advocates of federal aid to education had been campaigning, with little apparent effect, for years. The event which brought matters to a head was the appointment, in 1949, of a Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. The five-man Commission was composed of a university chancellor (as chairman), a university president, a university dean, a university professor, and a civil engineer.

It was charged with examining and making recommendations upon:

- (a) the principles upon which the policy of Canada should be based, in the fields of radio and television broadcasting;
- (b) such agencies and activities of the government of Canada as the National Film Board, the National Gallery, the National Museum, the National War Museum, the Public Archives and the care and custody of public records, the Library of Parliament; methods by which research is aided including grants for scholarships through various Federal Government agencies; the eventual character and scope of the National Library; the scope or activities of these agencies; the manner in which they should be conducted, financed and controlled, and other matters relevant thereto;
- (c) methods by which the relations of Canada with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and with other organizations operating in this field should be conducted;
- (d) relations of the government of Canada and any of its agencies with various national voluntary bodies operating in the field with which this inquiry will be concerned;¹

¹ Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, *Report*. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951, p. xii.

- (e) methods for the purpose of making available to the people of foreign countries adequate information concerning Canada;
- (f) measures for the preservation of historical monuments.²

Over a period of two years the Commission held public hearings from one end of the country to the other, received several hundred briefs, was aided by advisory committees, and commissioned a number of authorities to prepare critical studies on various fields within the area of investigation.

In Canada, education is within the jurisdiction of the provinces—a jealously guarded provincial right. Could the Commission concern itself with the universities? On this point the commissioners wrote in their report:

In the earlier stages of our inquiry we had thought that the universities of Canada were quite outside our Terms of Reference and consequently, that they should not be included in this survey. As our work progressed, however, we naturally found it impossible to ignore the role which Canadian universities play in the subjects with which we are formally concerned; and we were strengthened in our belief that we must take this matter under review by the many representations made to us. . . .

The universities are provincial institutions; but they are much more than that. It would be a grave mistake to underestimate or to misconceive the wider and indeed universal functions of these remarkable institutions. We are not here concerned with them as units in a formal educational system or as representing the final stage of an academic career. We are convinced, however, that we cannot ignore other functions so admirably performed by Canadian universities. They are local centres for education at large and patrons of every movement in aid of the arts, letters and sciences. They also serve the national cause in so many ways, direct and indirect, that theirs must be regarded as the finest of contributions to national strength and unity.³

With this conviction, they reviewed the work of the universities and found it good. They also found that the universities needed money, especially for the support of the humanities and the social sciences, and that university students too needed money.

So they recommended:

² *Ibid.*, p. xxi.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

- a. That in addition to the help already being given for research and other purposes the Federal Government make annual contributions to support the work of the universities on the basis of the population of each of the provinces of Canada.
- b. That these contributions be made after consultation with the government and the universities of each province, to be distributed to each university proportionately to the student enrollment.
- c. That these contributions be sufficient to ensure that the work of the universities of Canada may be carried on in accordance with the needs of the nation.⁴

They also recommended that the federal government establish a system of fellowships, scholarships, studentships and bursaries for graduate and undergraduate students, designed to aid 10,000 Canadian students a year—about one in five of those attending university.

The Commission's report was submitted to the Parliament of Canada on June 1, 1951. On June 19, just 18 days later, the government announced that \$7,100,000 would be appropriated for distribution to Canadian universities, as recommended by the Commission, for the academic year 1951-52. (At the time of writing the national scholarship program had not yet been authorized but seemed likely to receive early attention from the government.)

This was not the Canadian government's first venture in the provision of financial aid to universities and university students. In the year 1948-49, for example, federal government expenditure on higher education, exclusive of the costs of its two military training colleges, totalled \$27,293,901. Most of this (\$24,782,000) was for the university training of veterans of World War II. Research grants accounted for the better part of the balance, although \$205,000 was distributed to the provinces to be used for student aid—grants and loans.⁵ It was the first time, though, that universities had received completely unrestricted federal aid for their general services.

Distribution of the 1951-52 appropriation was made on the basis of fifty cents per head of the population of each province, with each province's share being divided among its universities and colleges in proportion to student enrollment. Canada's largest institution of higher learning, the University of Toronto and its federated colleges, received over a million dollars; some of the smaller colleges got under

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 355.

⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 495-6.

a thousand. Grants accounted for, roughly, from 5 to 45 per cent of the universities' revenues for the year.

Much of the credit for bringing the financial problems of the universities to the attention of the government and the people is due to the National Conference of Canadian Universities. The Conference planned and carried out an intensive publicity campaign while the Royal Commission was gathering evidence—a campaign of speeches, radio broadcasts, and newspaper stories and editorials. Its comprehensive brief to the Commission was well received and provided much of the material which went into the Commission's report. Nor did the Conference's contribution stop there. Its assistance was sought by the government throughout the process of drafting the university grants regulations, determining which institutions could qualify and planning the distribution procedure.

Little was said, either before or after the announcement of the grants, about the possibility that federal aid might mean federal control. Between 1943 and 1952 the government had spent \$140,000,000 on university training for veterans, \$17,500,000 of this as direct grants to the universities, without interfering in any way with the autonomy of those institutions. Underlining the government's awareness of the problem, the Prime Minister, in announcing the plan, said:

. . . in making these recommendations to parliament it is intended to avoid any possible suggestion that we are interfering in any way with the policies respecting education in the respective provinces. It is for that reason we wish the Minister of Finance to have the power to consult with and get assistance from the conference of Canadian universities for the purpose of drafting regulations that will provide for the allocation of this grant. . . I am sure there can be no suggestion that in doing this there will be any interference with the absolute autonomy of the provinces and the provincial institutions in the field of higher education.⁶

The "provincial rights" issue gave rise to a few rumblings from one province, but nobody turned down the money.

⁶ Canada, *House of Commons Debates*, Vol. 92, No. 94 (June 19, 1951), p. 4278.

Graduate Performance of Students from Accredited and Unaccredited Undergraduate Colleges

GEORGE W. ANGELL

IT HAS long been the custom of American graduate schools to consider the character and quality of the undergraduate college from which an applicant has been graduated. In general, a graduate of an unaccredited college applying for admission to a well known graduate school is either denied admission or is told that he will need to make up a number of undergraduate courses before being allowed to begin his graduate career. Such a policy carries an implicit assumption that a student obtains an inferior education from the unaccredited college to such an extent that it will impair the quality of his graduate study. This assumption is seldom tested by the collection and analysis of objective evidence. Nevertheless, if graduate schools follow their own teachings they will systematically evaluate their various standards for admission, curriculum requirements, degree requirements, and all other regulatory devices which are assumed to improve the graduate.

In 1948 it became apparent on a national scale that for several years to come there would be a serious shortage of elementary teachers. This emergency was met in New York State in several ways, one of which was the special graduate curriculum entitled "The Intensive Teacher Training Program." This program is now being offered by the teachers colleges under the aegis of the State University of New York and offers immediate temporary certification to selected liberal arts college graduates who successfully complete a summer of intensive classroom and laboratory professional preparation in elementary education. Prospect of immediate employment in September attracts many applicants. During the 1951 summer session approximately 500 holders of the Bachelors Degree were enrolled in this special graduate program offered by the State University Teachers College at New Paltz. The large number of applicants made it possible to set high standards for admission to the program. Careful selection procedures were utilized to find students capable of teaching with only six weeks of professional preparation.

In considering various factors to be used in selecting applicants the

Graduate Admissions Committee at New Paltz considered the quality of the undergraduate college. It was agreed to accept experimentally a number of students with good records from unaccredited colleges. In this particular instance accreditation was determined on the basis of membership in a regional accrediting association.

It is the purpose of this article to describe the procedure whereby the graduate records made by these students from unaccredited colleges were compared with the records made by similar students from well known accredited colleges, and to reveal some of the findings.

PROCEDURE

The total number of students admitted from unaccredited colleges was 40. From a list of some 600, there were selected 40 matching students representing well known accredited undergraduate colleges and universities. These 40 pairs of students were matched on the basis of sex, date of entrance in the program and undergraduate average. All 80 students were enrolled in the same graduate courses, but may have had different instructors. Some of the accredited colleges represented by the 40 students in the control group were: Barnard, Cornell, Bowling Green, Brooklyn, Hofstra, Hunter, New York University, St. Lawrence, Seton Hall, and Yale.

The cumulative graduate averages for all students were computed and compared by means of "t" ratios. Scattergrams were drawn up to indicate the relationship between graduate and undergraduate records but no correlation ratios were determined since normality of population did not exist. The population was skewed due to the fact that no students with an undergraduate average less than 2.00 were admitted to the program.

RESULTS

In general, the scattergrams revealed little correlation between undergraduate and graduate grades. This may be due, in part, to the fact that there is little similarity in course content between liberal arts undergraduate programs and this professional education program. For the total group of 80 students the average undergraduate cumulative record was 2.73* while the cumulative average for their graduate work was 3.03. These facts indicate that, in general, students made higher graduate grades than undergraduate, but only to the extent of

* A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1.

.30 of a letter grade. Another characteristic of the graduate averages was a definite clustering between 3.00 and 3.19 (3.00 equals B). Although at first glance this may seem rather high, it is in keeping with the trend in graduate schools of making B the lowest acceptable average for graduate work. The fact that only 21 per cent of the students achieved an average above 3.19 indicates to some extent, the relatively high standards which a student must meet in order to obtain a grade higher than B.

The average undergraduate grade made by the students from accredited colleges was 2.726+ while those from unaccredited colleges made an average of 2.734. Obviously the groups were well matched on the basis of undergraduate averages. In order to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the quality of work accomplished by students from the two kinds of undergraduate institutions, the graduate averages were computed. Graduate students from accredited colleges made an average of 3.050; while those from unaccredited colleges made an average of 3.011. The small difference between the means is clearly insignificant from a practical standpoint. A "t" ratio was computed and found to be 0.464 and leaves no doubt that the small difference is due to chance rather than the accreditation of the undergraduate college.

It so happened that 19 of the students admitted from undergraduate unaccredited colleges came from one particular institution. Analysis of variance technique was applied to check the difference in graduate averages made by these 19 students and their matched counterparts. Differences were statistically insignificant.

Summarizing the findings of this study, it seems clear that the 40 students selected from well known accredited undergraduate colleges performed no better in their graduate education work than did matched students from unaccredited colleges. It must be kept in mind that this conclusion was drawn from a study of grades made in graduate courses and is, therefore, subject to all of the known fallacies of graduate grades. The study indicates, nevertheless, that the factor of accreditation is invalid for selecting students to be admitted to this particular graduate program when performance in graduate courses is used as a criterion of success.

Good Will in Replying to Letters from Foreign Students Seeking Admission

DELL LEBO

"FROM my girlhood I had the warm desire to study and to become a useful member in society . . . the unique dream of love of my life is to study and to relieve my beloved parents who so much care to bring me up and make me study. I wish also to help my beloved Country, poor but glorious . . . which has so great necessity from his educated children who indeed love it.

"That is why I appeal to your great goodness and generosity and I pray you to grant me a scholarship to come to America, the Country of my Dreams.

"Two days ago I received 'The Certificate of Admission for the Florida State University' which you had the kindness to send me. Yesterday I got a letter about the same subject. I thank you very much for accepting me. . . . But as I already made you clear in previous letters I cannot come and study at my own expenses. I have a great need for a full scholarship. My father's salary is very low. As he scarcely gets our living he cannot dispose money for my studies. Last July I was graduated from the Gymnasium . . . being so the first of ninety five pupils in my class and I received the prize.

"Now I must search for a job since it is impossible for me to come to America the Country of Liberty and Progress and to study there, in your University.

"Thanking you again and hoping to grant me a full scholarship later.

I remain
respectfully yours . . ."

The registrar's office of every fair sized college must have one or more such letters from worthy but impecunious foreign students in the files. It is frequently evident that the foreign applicant has knowledge of only the single college or university to which he or she is writing. Should there be no scholarships available for such foreign applicants, the registrar's letter of reply usually follows one of two courses:

1. The student can be encouraged to make suitable financial arrangements for the first year of study. This is contingent upon the expectation that once the student has arrived on campus interested persons will be found to provide work or money to finance the remaining years of study.

2. The application can be rejected on the grounds of inadequate financial ability.

Both responses seem to be lacking in courtesy and in sufficiency of information. This is especially true if the foreign applicant seems to be unaware of other colleges and universities in the United States.

Letters of application from foreign students may be expected in increasing numbers in the next few years. The problem of what to say to worthy foreign students is one that should concern all registrars. Superior foreign students should be encouraged to study in this country even if they cannot be admitted to the particular institution of their choice. Individual college or university budgets may make it impossible to admit foreign students who cannot finance their education. However, since one of the soundest ways of building world understanding and international good will is through an exchange of students among nations, students should not be discouraged altogether from seeking an education in the United States.

As Dr. Sasnett¹ has put it: "The students who come from abroad for study with us . . . are the cream of the youth of the world outside our own borders. With the skills acquired in the United States they are slated to be world leaders. . . ."

If the letters of such people are ignored, regarded as a nuisance, or answered with a mechanical, "No," all of the ability and good wishes of the foreign students will be turned against us when they have matured and become active citizens and leaders in their countries.

Although worthy foreign students handicapped by a lack of finances may have to be denied admission to the particular college or university to which they apply, the letter from the registrar's office may still be one of hope, good will, and encouragement. The applicant may be unaware of full scholarship opportunities available elsewhere in the United States which have been set up expressly for foreign students. It would be doing a service both to the United States and to the foreign student to refer worthy foreign applicants to the Commit-

¹ Sasnett, Martina T., "Foreign Student Problems on American Campuses," *College and University*, XXVI (October, 1950), pp. 100-101.

tee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students,² 291 Broadway, New York 7, N.Y. This agency can supply foreign applicants with advice on scholarships, and also can furnish them with information on the United States and entering procedures. Furthermore, the committee can arrange to meet the foreign student at the port of debarkation.

A reply from the registrar indicating that while the particular institution cannot admit the student, there are other colleges and universities in the United States in a position to welcome worthy foreign students, would go far in encouraging good will, appreciation, and understanding of higher education in the United States. Here at Florida State University we believe that since such applicants will soon become citizens in a world order, it is advisable to adopt a policy of good will and encouragement in replying to their requests for admission. Consequently, it has become our policy to suggest they write to the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students, if we cannot admit them.

² Their booklet, *The Unofficial Ambassadors*, is published annually and serves as a clearinghouse for information on foreign students in the United States.

The Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges

J. GORDON HOWARD

COLLEGES and universities are having a rough time these days. Enrollments are down in most cases while expenses are soaring and going higher. This is not the first time that American colleges and universities have struck stormy weather, but the present crisis seems particularly severe since it comes on the heels of an economic depression, a world war, and an unprecedented "G. I. Bulge."

Casting about for every possible and honorable source of financial relief, the non-tax-supported colleges and universities in many states have united in a joint financial appeal to business and industrial corporations. The Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges is typical of these several state organizations.

It is well known that the non-tax-supported schools of higher learning are supported from three main sources of income: (1) Tuitions and fees from students; (2) Gifts from individual donors including alumni and other interested friends; (3) Returns from endowment and other permanent funds.

In the case of church-related colleges and universities, there is a fourth source of income, namely, contributions from denominational funds earmarked for educational purposes.

From these sources of financial receipts, many non-tax-supported schools year by year have paid their bills, balanced their books, and accumulated endowments. Under so-called normal conditions these colleges and universities dependent on private support got along fairly well with exceptions here and there. However, it was never easy. Much time, energy and anguish of soul were invested in financial solicitation efforts and almost continuous campaigns in order to make ends meet.

With the recent inflationary cycle even the most affluent schools find it difficult if not impossible to avoid deficits. In some larger institutions the shortages in current operating funds have run into astronomical figures. Financial officers once proud of their ability to avoid the use of red ink, have had to swallow their pride the last several years. College officials have found themselves obliged to be on the road,

constantly ringing doorbells and standing with hat in hand waiting on old and new friends in behalf of the current budget.

The reason for this unfortunate plight of the non-tax-supported colleges and universities, sometimes called the independent schools, is due to obvious causes. In the first place, tuition and fees have been raised and raised again, only to lag consistently behind the cost of educating students. Such tuition raises can go only so far. There is a ceiling above which tuition costs cause an institution to price itself out of the market. Independent colleges and universities once asked students to pay approximately one-third of their educational costs, with two-thirds being supplied from gifts and endowment income. Today the situation is reversed with students being asked to pay approximately two-thirds of their educational expenses, with the remaining third coming from other sources. Still budgets refuse to balance in many cases. Schools depending considerably on tuitions and fees for income believe they have reached the limit. To increase rates much more would work great injustice to many worthy young people who simply cannot stand higher costs. So about all is being realized from tuitions and fees that can be expected under present conditions.

In the second place, consider gifts from individual donors including alumni and other friends. Returns from these sources have increased by leaps and bounds. Annual campaigns among alumni have been promoted all over the country and have achieved remarkable success. Such schools as Yale and Dartmouth have been wise enough to cultivate their alumni for financial gifts over a period of many years. In other cases the annual solicitation of alumni is a new development. Today the raising of money from college and university alumni is big business. The record for 1950 reported by the American Alumni Council was a whopping \$17,000,000 through the alumni funds of 239 North American colleges and universities.

However with all the excellent response from loyal alumni and other interested friends there is not likely to be a phenomenal increase in returns from this source. There undoubtedly will be a gradual growth as alumni increase in numbers and as a larger percentage of alumni feel a responsibility to alma mater, but there is no foreseeable sudden upsurge which will solve the present emergency.

In the third place, there is the matter of returns on invested funds. There was a time when endowment was regarded as the essential back-log for institutional stability, and no school was accredited without a

sizeable sum invested in permanent funds. But additions to endowment funds and the returns from such funds have not kept pace with the financial needs of today's colleges and universities. Large endowments are not the result of nickels and dimes, although every little bit helps. Large endowments are built up by a succession of large gifts over a period of years. These large gifts are donations from wealthy friends, or they are bequests coming to a school upon the death of persons who have had an interest in higher education.

Nowadays large fortunes cannot be accumulated as they were in the past because of the current federal tax structure. Despite their generosity people cannot make the large contributions which used to be fairly common. It is true that more money is given now than ever before to colleges and universities, but this increase is due to the multiplication of donors rather than to the increase in the amounts of individual large gifts.

To make matters worse the income from institutional endowments is not what it used to be. Whereas six per cent income once was considered normal, today six per cent income on endowment is uncommon. In many cases endowment income is down to a half or two-thirds of what it used to be. Add to this reduced endowment income the fact that the dollar buys only one-half of what it once did, and you pyramid one problem on top of another.

In the fourth place, denominational support to church-related colleges must be taken into account. Such support is on the increase, and in some cases quite generous when compared with the relative penury of former times. But no church with its many missionary and benevolent demands can pour into institutions of higher education enough money to relieve fully the current budgetary distress.

Any one of the foregoing financial problems holds a real threat to the financial stability of American colleges and universities. In combination, coming all at once, these problems become overwhelming and almost insuperable. That colleges and universities have not succumbed in great numbers may be regarded as a modern miracle and a fact which speaks eloquently for the wisdom and courage of present-day college trustees, administrators, alumni and other friends, to say nothing of faculty members and students who in their own ways are bearing a considerable share of the financial burdens imposed upon educational institutions by present inescapable conditions.

Since relief is not to be expected from higher tuitions, larger gifts,

increased returns from endowment, or increased appropriations from churches, colleges and universities understandably have looked for other sources of revenue and have turned an eager eye toward prosperous business and industrial corporations. This is a source that has not been tapped to any great extent. Some industrial corporations have made contributions to educational institutions in which they felt a particular interest, but for the most part there has been no general disposition by corporations to feel responsible for independent colleges and universities.

There have been three chief reasons to explain the reluctance of corporations to feel responsible for the financial support of independent colleges and universities. In the first place, the laws of some states have made it seem illegal, or at least inadvisable, for a corporation to single out one or more educational institutions as the recipients of their generosity. In the second place, there was always the danger of stockholders raising objections or filing suit against the practice of a corporation making a donation out of its profits to an independent college or university. This caused some corporation executives to be timid about making corporation gifts to institutions of learning.

The third reason that has made corporations hesitate to contribute to colleges and universities is the lack of machinery whereby gifts can be made to a group of educational institutions to be divided according to a specified formula. If a corporation donated to one college or university and not to others, there was always the cry of favoritism and discrimination, and the next morning the corporation president found his front office filled with representatives from other colleges waiting in line for their turn.

To overcome these difficulties standing in the way of corporation gifts to colleges and universities, a number of efforts have been made. The first step in some states was to secure the enactment of laws which would clearly permit corporations to contribute to independent colleges and universities. The second step was to encourage corporations to see their responsibility. The third step was to organize a joint approach to corporations for funds. This idea of a joint approach seems to have begun among the presidents of some Indiana colleges. The idea was taken up by the colleges of Michigan. Ohio followed soon thereafter. Now there are some twenty state organizations in various stages of progress.

The Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges may be regarded as

fairly typical of these state organizations. It has had a reasonably successful response to its efforts, and on the basis of these facts it is described here.

In January 1950, at the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges in Cincinnati, eight Ohio college presidents discussed the possibility of a co-operative effort on the part of the independent colleges and universities jointly to approach Ohio corporations for funds to apply on current expense budgets to offset partly the deficits the schools were facing. The guiding spirit in this group of Ohio college presidents was Philip Henderson, then president of Western College for Women. The Ohio presidents in Cincinnati met with representatives of Indiana presidents and later consulted the Michigan independent college officials. Information was secured from other sources. Later in 1950 a meeting was held in Columbus to which all independent colleges and universities of Ohio were invited to send representatives. The possibility of an organization to approach corporations was discussed. Another meeting was held later at which college and university trustees along with presidents were present. These several meetings always resulted in an affirmative vote to continue investigation and planning. By the end of 1950 ideas had crystallized to such an extent that the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges was organized and chartered as a corporation not for profit. The constitution was approved, and April 15, 1951 was set as a deadline for charter memberships in the organization.

When April 15 arrived it was found that nineteen of Ohio's colleges and universities had applied for membership in the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges. Since that time three other schools have joined making twenty-two schools participating as members of the Foundation.

Some of the highlights of the organization and work of the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges are as follows:

Any school is eligible for membership which belongs to the Ohio College Association, and which is not supported by municipal or state taxes.

The Board of Trustees is composed of the presidents of the member institutions, plus an equal number of business men who are nominated and elected by the Board as Trustees-at-Large.

Each college president is pledged to contribute ten days per year to solicitation for the Ohio Foundation.

In visiting corporations, two college presidents go as a team; or the president of one school with a trustee of another college will form a team.

Any college or university which over a period of time has been receiving funds from a corporation may continue to do so. Except for such cases, no college or university belonging to the Foundation is permitted to solicit corporations for funds for current operating expenses. However, educational institutions may solicit corporations for capital funds or building funds.

Money coming into the treasury of the Foundation is divided as follows: 60 per cent equally to all member colleges, and 40 per cent proportionately according to the number of regular, full-time undergraduate students reported to the fall meeting of the Association of Ohio College Registrars.

Any donor shall have the right to designate his gift for a specific college or colleges, but such designated gifts are not encouraged. A designated gift to a college or university shall be deducted from the sum it otherwise would receive from the proportionate distribution of the 40 per cent of undesignated gifts.

The total budget to operate the Foundation likewise is assessed to the member colleges on a 60-40 basis; 60 per cent of the budget being assessed equally to all the member colleges, and 40 per cent allocated in proportion to the number of regular, full-time, undergraduate students.

There is an Executive Committee of six persons which meets frequently to conduct the business of the Foundation between the sessions of the Board of Trustees.

Early in the planning for the Ohio Foundation it became evident that there should be a full-time Executive Secretary with a headquarters office. Mr. Harold K. Schellenger, one time Director of Public Relations of the Ohio State University, is the Executive Secretary with offices at 51 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio. A full-time assistant to the Executive Secretary is to be employed this year.

The first money received by the Foundation was a check for \$5.00 from a woman who read concerning the OFIC in the newspapers and desired to help a good cause. The first organized solicitation of funds began in November 1951 in Cleveland where there were a number of trustees of the member schools. These resident trustees took the initiative in organizing the Cleveland campaign. Most of the presidents of

the member colleges and universities participated in the Cleveland effort.

Following Cleveland, campaigns were organized in Dayton, Columbus, Canton, Cincinnati and other cities. Corporations located in smaller communities were solicited by mail. The largest gift was \$35,000.

The response to the first efforts was encouraging, although there were some handicaps. In certain cases corporation budgets for gifts had been allocated for the year so nothing would be forthcoming until later. In other cases corporations were helping one or more schools in the community and so did not see their way clear to give additional sums to the Foundation. Again corporations could not make a donation because their policies in such matters were decided at a headquarters office in another state. Some corporations wished absolute assurance that no legal barrier existed in the state laws.

In the vast majority of cases there were no questions raised and no opposition evidenced to the principle and purpose of the Foundation.

At the close of the first fiscal year, April 15, 1952, the total amount received from corporation gifts was \$190,865. Of this amount the largest member school with an enrollment of nearly 2,000 students received \$17,558. The smallest school with an enrollment of 200 students received \$7,099.

Plans are under way, of course, to continue the program of the OFIC, strengthen its executive staff and increase the tempo of its operations. The participants in the Ohio Foundation believe in the soundness of the objectives of the organization. The Standard Oil Company of Ohio has inaugurated a statewide scholarship plan to be administered by the Ohio Foundation, the scholarships to be used in schools belonging to the Foundation.

The next step in the whole movement would seem to be a national agency to co-ordinate and give guidance to the various state agencies now in existence and growing rapidly. That such a national office may be established soon seems likely, certain large educational foundations being interested in helping to maintain such an enterprise.

In concluding this statement concerning the Ohio Foundation which is typical of other such state organizations with a similar purpose, it should be made clear that the so-called independent or non-tax-supported schools in no way place themselves in a competitive position with the state and municipal institutions which are supported

by tax funds. The independent schools feel that the responsibility of higher education is so large as to require colleges and universities of various types and kinds. Furthermore, it is important that all schools secure as much financial support as possible. That which strengthens any one school eventually strengthens all.

The Constitution of the Ohio Foundation begins with these four paragraphs:

"We believe that our institutions of higher education, both tax-supported and non-tax-supported, make an indispensable contribution to the life of America;

"We believe that the respective municipalities and states should provide adequate funds for the maintenance of tax-supported educational institutions;

"We believe that the preservation of non-tax-supported institutions of higher education depends upon the voluntary, generous gifts of individuals, groups, corporations, foundations, and other organizations that recognize these independent and church-related institutions of higher education as an essential part of our American democracy;

"We believe that men of vision, both as private citizens and as leaders of business and industry, are increasingly aware of their stake in keeping the 36 non-tax-supported colleges of Ohio strong and independent, thus relieving the burden of heavier taxation and preserving the American ideals of freedom."

Teaching the Bible in Non-Sectarian Colleges¹

A. C. HOWELL

I

AN EAGER but misguided student, when asked, "What is the Matterhorn?" replied with great presence of mind: "The Matterhorn is a large horn to be blown when something is the matter." I want to blow the Matterhorn this morning, because I have reached the conclusion that something is the matter with our students' knowledge of the Bible. This is no startling conclusion; and even the most elementary research, with or without a questionnaire, the beloved tool of the professional educators, will prove my conclusion. The truth is that all teachers of English literature not only suspect but know it to be a fact. Students are woefully, hopelessly ignorant when it comes to even the most elementary knowledge of the Bible. Within the last two years two articles viewing the current situation with alarm have presented data gathered by questionnaires from the Bible Belt of South Carolina, and the stern and rock-bound home of our Pilgrim Fathers. Perhaps a brief review of their findings will not be out of place.

Professor Hampton M. Jarrell, in the December, 1950, *Atlantic*, opines that "Sunday Schools Don't Teach." To prove his contention he submitted a simple test of biblical names to 34 juniors and seniors in an English class at a woman's college in South Carolina. The biblical people he chose for identification were: Benjamin, Abraham, Potiphar, Haman, Jonathan, Saul, Simon the Zealot, Pontius Pilate, Lazarus, and Lot. Most of the answers he received were vague, confusing, or downright wrong. He counted as right any statement relating the character to the right Bible story, however vague or confusing. Here are the startling results. No student got all ten right, two missed only one, one got all of them wrong. Fifteen could offer only a blank for every name except Pontius Pilate, and three missed that. More than half the group had six or more incorrect answers, by the most generous grading.

The results became more startling when Professor Jarrell inquired

¹ A paper presented before the Virginia-North Carolina Section of the College English Association at Richmond, Virginia, November 17, 1951.

into the backgrounds which produced such ignorance. He found that most of the young ladies were regular attendants at church and Sunday school, and had been since childhood. " 'All right,' " comments a sceptical reader: " 'Lots of people don't know anything about the Bible or about religion. So what? They are probably better off'. That's one point of view but not the only one," concludes Professor Jarrell. It does matter, he thinks. "Students aren't learning the Bible because nobody is teaching them," he believes. It is a job that the Sunday schools should do; but after examining the Sunday school literature of his own denomination, he makes some startling discoveries. "I did not find," he writes, "anything at all about the Old Testament . . ." nor ". . . any systematic or consecutive presentation of the teaching of Christ. . . . The very foundation of our ethical and religious thinking as it evolved through the Old and New Testaments was virtually ignored."

"The Bible, particularly the New Testament, serves as a grab bag of arguments for or against whatever current practice or ideology the writer is defending or attacking. Verses extracted from the various gospels . . . serve to flavor sure-fire panaceas for all the ills of our complicated industrial system . . . (while) . . . those who concoct these discussions seem never to have realized that a text without its context is a pretext."

A similar test given at the University of North Carolina yielded almost identical results. The class average was 53, with only seven papers of 70 or higher, one perfect paper, and two zeros.

Writing in the Autumn, 1949, *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Professor Walter H. Clark reaches similar conclusions regarding what he calls the "Biblical illiteracy" of American college students. His simple test of twenty questions, given to one hundred and thirty-seven men and women in north-eastern colleges, was somewhat broader in scope than Professor Jarrell's, and somewhat easier. Sample questions, two from the ten on the Old Testament and two from the New, are:

1. Name a person who lived in the Garden of Eden.
8. "The Lord is my shepherd," is from what book?
12. In what town was Jesus born?
18. Who wrote many of the epistles?

The average grade made on this simple test, on which most college students of a hundred, or even fifty years ago could probably have

scored ninety to one hundred per cent, was, for the New England students of 1948, just over fifty per cent. Professor Clark thinks that the appalling ignorance which he exposed in his analysis of the answers, some of which are pathetically amusing, is fairly typical among the current generation of college students. "A rabbi in Mazarine baptized Jesus," wrote one student; another had Jonah leading the Children of Israel out of Egypt; a third identified the man whose strength lay in his hair as Pericles. Professor Clark goes on to note that students lose much by their lack of knowledge of the Bible, not merely in their inability to comprehend literary allusions, but also in their failure to understand the bases for many political and social ideas which are a part of our biblical inheritance. He writes, "If we wish our college youth to understand such things, we must first see that they learn considerably more than they now know about the Bible." The answer to this remark is, naturally, to provide opportunities for courses in the Bible for college students. Professor Clark wrote to college presidents in his neighborhood for help and comment on this problem. In his summary of the twenty-three replies he received, he points out general agreement, except in colleges where Bible courses are required, upon the "biblical illiteracy" of college students. Other significant notes were: recognition of a decline in interest in Bible courses, perhaps in part attributable to "the whole mood of sectarianism" which has "gradually eliminated the Bible from its place in the curriculum"; and a general feeling that required courses had been eliminated as no longer desirable in most colleges because they were not considered to be the solution. One president remarked that "college students will not take to the Bible seriously if exhorted to do so." Indeed the trend seems to be away from required courses even in sectarian colleges, "toward courses which under other names introduce biblical material."

The rest of Professor Clark's articles deals with the problem of establishing courses in the Bible and making them successful. A strong department of Bible, such as the one at Wellesley, or a competent and inspiring teacher, as were Professors Penniman at Pennsylvania, Walker at Ohio Wesleyan, and Moulton at Chicago, will assure the success of courses in the Bible. But such assets to a faculty come high, and administrators are not eager to spend money on courses so little related to reality. A first-rate professor in marketing, or statistics, or physical education, may command a five-figure salary and the respect

of the president; but how can that official justify to hard-boiled trustees paying a handsome salary to a professor to teach a book that thousands of Sunday school teachers mangle every Sunday? Professor Clark remarks that "any college that really feels the Bible and religion important enough may succeed in establishing a successful department, though it may mean the spending of more money and the changing of emphases . . . (but) . . . The best ally for reviving the Bible . . . is the Bible itself. Any teacher with his faculties half alive to the rich opportunities offered him can capture the interest of all but the most perverse undergraduate. . . .

"With half an opportunity, students will recognize the value of the greatest work in our cultural tradition. But first of all it is the faculty, administrators and trustees who must sense the importance of the Bible and feel its appeal."

Professor Clark suggests one difficulty in the way of widespread study of the Bible in college courses when he remarks that any college can have good and popular courses in the Bible if the administration is willing to spend the necessary funds. But when a single school—in this instance, the medical school—is reported to consume sixty per cent of the budget of one of our great New England universities; and when the combined total of teachers having professorial rank in five departments—Art, Classics, Dramatic Arts, German, and Romance Languages—in the Division of Humanities at the University of North Carolina is only one more than that of the single Department of Economics and Commerce (44-43), according to the current catalogue, it is not hard to see in what direction the wind is blowing.

This trend toward secularization of higher education has been gaining momentum since World War II. Two eminent divines, speaking from the platform of the Association of American Colleges at a recent meeting in Boston, presented the Catholic and the Protestant points of view on this important development. Because of this trend, even denominational colleges are finding it increasingly difficult to attract student bodies to their religious-centered curricula, and indeed many have abandoned the pretense. "Secularization," remarks Archbishop Cushing, has made "the American policy of separation of Church and State" a "screen for its own religious attitudes and objectives." Indeed it might almost be called a new religion in opposition to the Judeo-Christian. The Archbishop finds a firm ally in Nicholas Murray Butler, whose penetrating analysis he quotes: "An

odd situation has been permitted to arise. The separation of Church and State is fundamental in our American political order, but so far as religious instruction is concerned, this principle has so far been departed from as to put the whole force and influence of the tax-supported school on the side of one element in the population, namely that which is pagan and believes in no religion whatsoever. . . . The government's indifference to religion must not be allowed to become opposition to religion."

This secularization of education, to paraphrase the Archbishop, has carried over into collegiate education, both public and private; and religion has not been merely departmentalized in our liberal arts curricula, it has been "consciously eliminated or unconsciously neglected."

In a similar vein the eminent Protestant divine, Dr. George A. Buttrick, points out that the curriculum of the modern college "has reflected the proportion, or rather disproportion of the new *Encyclopedia Americana*, which, in one volume, has the following distribution: to Jesus Christ, 9 columns; to the Labor Movement in America, 10 columns; to Kinematics of Machinery, 11 columns; to Kansas, 12 columns; and to Jewelry, 14 columns. Let the labor movements represent our interminable political and economic debates, kinematics our cult of applied science, Kansas our deification of property, and jewelry our money—and this list reflects our public life."

As a result of such points of view the place of the Bible in the curriculum has become very small indeed. To take a realistic view of the matter, one has only to note that while Bible courses are available, nobody is taking them. At the University of North Carolina last year 155 individuals registered for courses in the Bible (and some of these represent the same person taking several courses), and 159 took a lantern-slide course entitled Archeology of the Bible, a total of 314; whereas even Latin was more popular, with 396 registrations, and 1362 people registered for courses in accounting. No more eloquent figures than these could be cited to indicate the secularization of higher education.

The problem of how to restore a sane interest in religion in American higher education "is one not of undergraduate but of faculty neglect," writes B. I. Bell in the *Christian Century* (September 22, 1948). The neglect, he thinks, is to be blamed on the attitudes of graduate and professional schools which control the content of the

undergraduate curricula even in independent colleges. They train the teachers of the next generation. In their training programs they leave no place for courses in the Bible, and the leaders they thus train are not interested in such courses; so the vicious cycle goes on. Even those who pay lip service to the importance of the Bible take few overt steps toward realization of their ideas. Almost every English department requires a course in Shakespeare of all its English majors; yet almost none requires a course in the English Bible. I submit that not even Shakespeare is of greater value and importance to a student of English Literature than is the Bible.

And I suspect that Canon Bell and Professor Clark are right in feeling that college administrators, beginning with the humblest adviser to freshmen and ending with the dean of the college, are certainly in part responsible for the conditions I have been discussing. Few students will take Bible courses unless advised to do so; yet most of those who take them are pleased with the results. They have been informed and inspired. They have come to be on familiar terms with deathless and noble utterances found in this, the world's greatest storehouse of religious literature. The importance of the Bible has been dealt with by Professor Hoxie N. Fairchild in his Hazen Foundation booklet, *Religious Perspective in College Teaching in English Literature*, and by John L. Lowes in his famous essay, "The Greatest English Classic." I need not borrow their eloquence to proclaim the virtues of Bible study.

II

We have now scanned the field—to find, not much to our surprise, students hopelessly illiterate in their knowledge of the Bible; to find study of the Bible neglected in the colleges, which have become more and more secular in outlook; and, if we were concerned about morals, I might have added, to find students who frequently do not even follow the precepts laid down in the Bible, witness the recent athletic scandals that have filled the pages of our newspapers. Let us turn to a somewhat brighter picture, which has been pieced together from a study of college course offerings in the field of the Bible. These data indicate that it is not because students have no opportunity that they are unacquainted with the Bible. They have plenty of opportunity; the courses are available.

The statistical survey summarized in the following table, is not as complete as it could have been had it been possible to use a question-

naire or correspond personally with all the 1308 senior institutions listed in *Higher Education* for 1950, the Education Directory of the United States Office of Education. Based on an examination of college catalogues and a few return post-cards to secure information from important institutions for which catalogues were not available or were incomplete, the study covers 34 per cent of the 739 public and non-sectarian private institutions of higher education in the United States. Every type of institution is represented: state, municipal, teachers', technical, and private; colleges and universities both large and small are included in the statistical summary. Practically all of the more important ones were surveyed. On the assumption that the 569 senior institutions under the control of religious groups would be certain to offer courses in the Bible, the study was concerned only with the other seven hundred odd of the total for the United States.

To be sure that the list was as representative as possible, all the state universities, many municipal colleges, and 33 out of the 36 members of the Association of American Universities, including all except the Catholic University of America and the two Canadian universities, were surveyed. In addition, the list included almost every non-sectarian institution appearing on the approved list which until recently was published annually in the *Report* of the Association of American Universities. Of the total (289 institutions) which appeared on this list in the 1943 report, 96 were under religious control; 183 of the rest, that is, all except ten, were included in the survey. The study is, therefore, more than a mere sampling. It does include, undoubtedly, a number of private institutions which although no longer under denominational control, still maintain strong religious ties and still stress courses in the Bible in their curricula. Of these Oberlin and Duke may serve as examples. The decision, however, to exclude an institution from the survey was based on the classification found in *Higher Education*, regardless of personal or general knowledge about the educational policies. The number of such institutions is not great enough, however, to affect the percentage totals. Made up of "non-sectarian colleges," the list represents approximately 34 per cent of the total in the United States; but it includes all but a small minority of the leading senior colleges, universities, and technical schools.

And what were the results of the survey? Before I break them down in detail, let me state them briefly, after a word of explanation.

The total of 250 institutions included 18, equally divided between public and private, which offered Bible courses both in departments of English and in other departments, such as religion, philosophy, or Bible. To present a true picture of Bible course offerings in departments of English, and in senior institutions in general, this duplication has been ignored in some of the percentage totals. The following table contains the results:

Senior Institutions in the U. S.	1308	
Public control	339	
Private control	400	
Religious control	569	
Number of Institutions surveyed	250	34 % of non-sectarian institutions
Public control	118	
Private control	132	
Bible courses available to undergraduates		
Institutions with Bible courses	205	82 %
Institutions without Bible courses	45	18 %
Institutions with Bible courses		
In English Departments	89	35.6%
In other departments	134	53.6%
In both English and other departments	18	7 %
In other departments only	116	46.6%

It appears, then, that if the sample is representative, 82 per cent of all American senior, non-sectarian colleges and universities offer courses in the Bible in their curricula. This percentage becomes even more surprising when we remember that it is based on a survey of the 739 institutions not controlled by religious bodies; and when we consider that out of the total of 1308 institutions, 569 are under religious control and may therefore be assumed to offer courses in the Bible in their curricula, we discover that undoubtedly more than 82 per cent of our senior institutions may be assumed to have Bible courses. A simple mathematical calculation, which even an English professor can perform, will show this.

If the large sample surveyed be considered representative, then 18 per cent of the 739 non-sectarian institutions may be assumed not to offer courses in the Bible, that is, 133 institutions; therefore, by subtraction we find that 606 out of the 739 probably do have such courses. If we add to this figure the 569 institutions under religious control, we obtain a grand total of 1175 senior institutions in the United States which may reasonably be assumed to offer courses in the Bible. This figure represents 89.8 per cent of the 1308 institutions

listed in *Higher Education* for 1950. Such a high figure appears all the more surprising after what has been said about the trend toward secularization in higher education. Even such purely technical institutions as North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, Purdue University, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, and many teacher-training colleges provide courses in the Bible. The number of teachers colleges which provide such courses is perhaps not surprising; yet such schools, with their emphasis on the technical aspects of the teaching profession, are not usually thought of as places where Bible courses may be available.

A study similar to this, concerned entirely with teachers colleges, was conducted by Mr. O. T. Richardson, who published his results in the *North Central Association Quarterly* for January, 1950 under the title, "Teaching Religion and Philosophy in Sixty-five Teachers Colleges in North Central Territory." Using the technique of catalogue examination, Mr. Richardson found in his restricted list that 26 of the 65 institutions offered courses in religion, or about 40 per cent. More significant in the light of our study were his discoveries that about 54 per cent, 14 out of the 26, offered such courses in departments of English, and that approximately 65 per cent of the courses offered mentioned the Bible as the basic subject taught. Mr. Richardson lists and analyzes the titles, and concludes that there is a marked tendency to encourage courses in the Bible or religion as electives in teacher-training curricula. That these courses are recognized as an important ingredient in the training of teachers is clearly stated in a significant comment which Mr. Richardson quoted from a teachers' college catalogue: "The purpose of the Bible course is to give a student a definite and organized knowledge of the contents of the English Bible, in order that its historical, literary, and spiritual value may be fully appreciated and may become a useful tool in character building." Such an ideal for the Bible course seems to me thoroughly admirable. Certainly the secondary-school teacher has an opportunity to build character, and a thorough course in the Bible would appear to offer endless possibilities. I must confess, however, that I never before thought of the Bible as a subject for a "tool course."

Surprising also was the fact brought out by the figures that such a large number of institutions offer Bible courses through their English departments—over one third, to be exact. As was noted, in several institutions Bible courses were available both in the department of Eng-

lish and in the department of religion or even in a Bible department. This situation is all to the good in my opinion, for it is my belief that authorities should encourage the teaching of this classic whether in or out of the English department. Even with offerings in more than one department, the actual number of students who take such courses, unless they are required, is usually small, and the percentage of the student body pitifully low. Last year, for instance, at the University of North Carolina, this figure was about 3 per cent of the undergraduate enrollment.

If we break down our statistics into courses in public and in private institutions, a curious fact shows up. We find that 69 per cent of the public institutions offer the Bible course in the English department against 31 per cent of the private institutions; the situation is almost reversed if the Bible courses are offered in departments other than English: 64 per cent of the private institutions have departments of religion or Bible; whereas 36 per cent of the public institutions have such departments. For institutions having no courses in the Bible, the percentages are; 60 per cent public, and 40 per cent private.

It was gratifying also to learn that only four of the state universities and technical colleges covered in the survey—representing a total of 65 institutions—failed to offer courses in the Bible. The conclusion is surely inescapable that if the average student wants to study the Bible, he has the opportunity. *But*, when we look at his crowded curriculum of required courses, majors, minors, languages, mathematics, sciences, social sciences, and English composition, we find that Joe College has precious little of his time left to devote to such purely humanistic electives as the Bible.

If, however, he pages through his catalogue, what sort of course is he likely to find? Since we are mainly concerned with the sort of course he might find listed in the English department, let us look once more at our statistics. More detailed examination of the course offerings in departments of English reveals a uniform pattern which is due partly to tradition induced by the organization of texts, as well as the Bible itself, and partly to the arbitrary limitations which members of the English teaching staff feel compelled to adopt in justification for their offering courses which are, strictly speaking, neither English nor American literature. The types course was the most popular, since it enables the instructor to stress the varieties of literature encountered in the Bible and at the same time to avoid the pitfall of which non-

sectarian colleges are so well aware—that of making the Bible course one in which theology and religious values are paramount in emphasis.

Ranged in order of their popularity, the titles used were:

The Bible as Literature	27
Appreciation of the English Bible (or)	
The Bible as English Literature	20
The Literature of the Bible	15
The English Bible as a Literary Classic	10
The Old Testament as Literature	10
The New Testament as Literature	6

The following titles, or close variants of them, appeared three times or less: The Influence of the Bible on Secular Writers; The Bible in English Literature; Backgrounds of English and American Literature, including the Bible; Our Literary Heritage; including the Bible; Classical Myth and the Bible in English Literature.

If we lump together the titles which suggest the influence of the Bible on English and American literature, nine or ten courses fall into this category. Doubtless most instructors teaching Bible courses in departments of English deal at least in passing with this relationship of the Bible to the work of the masters. Indeed a number of books cover the field both in general and in minute detail. References to the fact that the course stresses "Biblical themes in English literature" were fairly common, and this statement bears out the truth of my generalization. Another fairly obvious deduction that may be drawn from the course descriptions was the result of the frequent reference to the King James version. Teachers of English may claim that this version is, as J. L. Lowes said, an English classic; and they hasten to add this bit of justification for teaching Bible courses. A small number include in their course descriptions references to the history of the Bible as a book, especially its collection, transmission, and translation. Certainly anyone who is familiar with A. S. Cook's excellent chapter in Volume IV of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* is aware of the possibilities of a few class-hours devoted to the inspiring story of Wycliff, Tyndale, Coverdale, and the King James translators.

With regard to quantity of courses available, the largest number of separate courses in the Bible in English departments are found at the University of Michigan and at Boston University. Double courses were fairly common, at least 23 being so designated, though they were usually independent. The normal division point was between the Old

and the New Testaments. Naturally all courses were electives so far as catalogue notations indicated.

A typical course description is that from Oregon State College: "English 275. The Bible as Literature. Designed to enlarge appreciation of the art and beauty of Bible folk-lore, story telling, history, poetry, drama, wisdom literature, oratory and essay. Theology and dogma are avoided."

The desire of secular institutions to offer students an opportunity to study the Bible as literature, and the emphatic denial of any religious or theological implications are to be commended; yet, I for one, as a teacher of the Bible, refuse to be hemmed in by any narrow dogma of secularism into ignoring the religious values of the Bible. It is beyond my imagination to see how any teacher who genuinely loves his material can ignore these noble, deathless utterances setting forth the claims of social justice, the moral and ethical standards of the great prophets and the New Testament writers, and the ideals of faith and hope which animate our Judeo-Christian civilization. It seems to me unwise and unnecessary to treat the Bible as if it were the *Spectator Papers* or the novels of Hardy. It is a religious book; and I for one believe that its religious values should not be ignored. The skillful teacher, without becoming an evangelist, may lead his students to see beyond the "literary" aspects of the Bible to the deep spiritual wisdom with which it abounds, and perhaps unconsciously make them earnestly desire, like Pilgrim in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, to treasure this volume as a guidebook through all the vicissitudes of their lives.

It is not the purpose of this paper to analyze in detail the course offerings in the Bible given in departments of Religion or Bible. Suffice it to say that in these departments also at least one course and often several are devoted to study of the Bible as literature. I doubt very much if the methods and syllabi of such courses differ appreciably from those offered in departments of English. Specialized courses were more common, as was to be expected, on such topics as the prophets, Biblical poetry, the life and teachings of Jesus, and of Paul. I should note in passing that to me it was a pleasant surprise to find that a fairly large number, 25, that is, 36 per cent, to be exact, of the major state institutions covered in this study, had departments of religion. If we may judge from our experience at the University of North Carolina, where such a department was set up about seven

years ago, there is tendency to encourage such departments, perhaps indicating a slight swing of the pendulum away from the secularization deplored by Archbishop Cushing. But at present, if we may judge by our registration figures, the movement is hardly perceptible.

As has been already noted, a few institutions have courses in the Bible both in the department of English and in a separate department of religion, as we do at the University of North Carolina. An examination of the titles and descriptions of such courses shows that they seldom duplicate each other. Nor is duplication a serious fault—witness the large number of courses in statistics taught in three or four departments in many universities. Students genuinely interested in the Bible will profit from getting several points of view, and the teacher of English, trained primarily as a teacher of literature, is likely to stress the artistic and cultural aspects of the Bible and point out how its materials have been used by the great masters of English and American literature from Chaucer to T. S. Eliot; whereas the teacher in a department of religion or Bible or philosophy is more likely to develop the special interests of his own field of specialization and training.

III

In the remainder of this paper I wish to make two general observations growing out of my experience in gathering and studying this material. The first concerns the suitability of the English department as a home base for courses in the Bible. An excellent argument for maintaining or providing such courses in the English department can be found in the statistical sections of this paper. That over one-third of the colleges surveyed had Bible courses in English departments argues strongly for their suitability, and establishes ample precedent for developing them even if the college maintains a separate department of religion.

Obviously, as a number of the course descriptions indicate, the close relation between the Bible and the masterpieces of our literature, makes a Bible course in the English department a splendid means of enriching the backgrounds of our English majors so that they may study our literature with a fuller understanding. The Goucher College course, English 56, entitled "Backgrounds of English and American Literature," illustrates what I mean. While not entirely devoted to the Bible, the course does require the reading of large sec-

tions from it. Such a course is naturally a part of the English department offerings, and rightly so.

Another minor corollary in this connection is that study of the Bible fits beautifully into any program of courses in the English Renaissance and seventeenth century, for then the English were, as the historian Greene so eloquently explains, "the people of a book, and that book the Bible." To understand the literature of the period of Donne and Milton and Dryden without understanding what one of my students called the "St. James Translation" is clearly an impossibility. For this reason, if for no other, the English department might well be induced to set up a course in the Bible.

Moreover, English teachers, trained in the art of teaching literature, are well qualified, even without a knowledge of the original languages, to interpret the Bible to undergraduates, to point out its great merits as literature, and to make apt comparisons between the literary forms discussed—whether folk-lore or dramatic dialogue, essay or short story—and those in our own literature. This is said not to disparage those trained especially to teach the Bible; yet it must in all frankness be admitted that *some* Bible teachers may be inclined to stress the "sacred" or "inspired" qualities of the Bible at the expense of its qualities as literature. My contention is that a teacher trained in dealing with secular literature would be less likely to succumb to these temptations. This is a third reason why I favor placing at least one Bible course in the English department.

The tendency, abused in some quarters, to treat the Bible as so sacred as not to be handled critically or even intelligently, was no doubt responsible for the practical abandonment of required Bible courses in private colleges as their faculties grew more liberal, and the abolition of all Bible courses in many public institutions. I remember well the fight to have Bible courses restored at the University of North Carolina after a lapse of many years. The arguments against teaching the Bible hinged on the hoary tradition of the separation of church and state. Bible teachers, it was said, would be bound to teach Baptist, or Catholic, or Calvinistic dogma and theology. Only twenty years ago the issue was settled in favor of allowing courses in the Bible in the English, Classics, and History departments. It was argued that teachers in these departments would not be inclined to stress any brand of religious dogma or theology.

One might argue also that other points of view not always desirable

in undergraduate study of the Bible are not likely to be stressed by a teacher of literature because he is not likely to have the training to stress them. I refer to such special approaches to Bible study as the socio-anthropologic, the philosophic, the comparative religion, or the purely historic approach. Interesting and profitable as these are, they are usually not the ones desired for a general course in a public institution, any more than is the sectarian approach. The problem, therefore, boils down to another argument in favor of having the Bible taught by a teacher of literature in the department of English. He is likely to be an un-theological teacher; and by virtue of the methods of teaching with which he is most familiar, he is likely to demand and get a certain amount of actual reading and study of the Bible itself from his students. If he is a master of his craft, he is likely to open their eyes for the first time to the beauties of this great literary classic and perhaps permanently inspire them to learn to love and cherish it.

My final observation is concerned with the proper approach for a teacher of English who ventures to offer a course in the Bible in the English department.

In the preface to the *Revised Standard Version* of the New Testament occurs a sentence which summarizes briefly what I wish to observe concerning the various types of approaches usually found in courses in the Bible. The revisers wrote, "In the Bible we have not only an historical document and a classic of English literature but the Word of God." Here are noted the three normal approaches which a teacher of the Bible may use in presenting his materials.

We may dismiss briefly the final approach suggested by "the Word of God." This may be called the religious approach. In the first place, teachers of English go well beyond their province and training if they present the Bible primarily as the Word of God. Such an approach is the province of religious leaders. Nevertheless the religious approach was the standard method of studying the Bible fifty years ago. The method was to take up the Bible book by book, analyze each, select passages of special interest as religious evidence, as for example, the prophecies of the coming of Christ in Isaiah, and such doctrines as justification by faith in Galatians, or by works, in James. Many excellent manuals of Bible study use this method, and doubtless the Bible is so taught in some college courses. A modern version of the plan and methods to be followed in such a course is beautifully and

clearly set forth in Professor Bernhard Anderson's new book, *Rediscovering the Bible* (N. Y.: Association Press, 1951). The approach will be indicated if one examines some of his chapter titles, among which are: I. The New World of the Bible (In what sense is the Bible the Word of God?), II. God's Action in History, V. The Day of the Lord's Anger (Is the Christian God truly the God of Wrath?), VIII. God was in Christ (Why do Christians believe in the divinity of Christ?)

In his preface Professor Anderson remarks that "the presentation is made from a 'confessional' rather than an allegedly neutral standpoint," and later that "the Bible presents a historical pageant, the theme of which is the triumphant working out of God's purpose. . . . With this central theme in mind, we shall attempt to describe the dynamic movement of the drama toward that climax which is the 'Good News' of the New Testament." While admitting that his approach "results in glaring omissions," he maintains that it "seeks to awaken the interest of ordinary young people." The book follows the historical movement culminating in the establishment of the Christian Church, and, as the jacket points out, "deepens and enriches Christian faith." Here, in essence, is the modern theological, or religious, approach to a study of the Bible. While I admire such a method in its place, I could not recommend it for a teacher of English, even though this particular book, setting it forth so gracefully, was written chapter by chapter with the help and criticism of students in Professor Anderson's course at the University of North Carolina. Several of these students I know well; and I know they have been greatly affected by the experience of a course under his inspired guidance.

An approach such as his has much to commend it if it is offered in a department of religion by a professor trained in that field. Even then, in a non-sectarian institution, it is likely to be tinged with theology or dogma which would be disturbing to some. I do not feel that the religious approach is a wise one for a professor of English to use in a course in the English Bible, though I well recognize that the religious values of the Bible ought not to be neglected.

It is possible, perhaps, to combine the point of view just discussed with that of a teacher of literature, in such a combination approach as is suggested by Professor C. A. Dinsmore in the preface to his excellent *The English Bible as Literature*.² He suggests that the classi-

² Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1931.

fication of the scriptures by types, used in many books, has a disadvantage because, as he notes, "It is analytical and fails to communicate the total effect of the writings. . . . A book is a living thing and not seen at its best on the dissecting table. Therefore the author begins with Genesis and follows with considerable consistency the unfolding thought and high spiritual adventure of this vast Epic of Redemption, discusses the different types of writing as they are met, and brings out the permanent spiritual truths of the individual books. The effect is cumulative and tends to make the Bible a living book. . . ."

While the method outlined by Professor Dinsmore's book has many advantages, when it is used, the literary values are likely to become lost in the religious values; for this reason I would discard the religious-literary approach.

Likewise the approach of the historian, found in many courses offered in departments of Bible and religion, has its dangers for an English teacher. It contains too much history; and therefore the literary insights, which are its sole excuse for being a course in English literature, are likely to be slighted. The historical approach is effectively represented in Professor Elmer W. K. Mould's monumental 678-page *Essentials of Bible History*.³ A quotation from the preface will make this clear: "This basic Bible course starts on the human-interest level with a study of biblical lands and peoples, and their manners and customs of daily life. The study of the development of Biblical history is closely integrated with ancient history in general. The point of view of this textbook is historical, and it aims to guide the student to correct historical understanding and interpretation and constructive appreciation of the Bible." Professor Mould's exhaustive treatment provides a thorough history of the Hebrew people, the early Christian Church and the Bible itself. By means of tables and references, the types of literature found in the Bible may be studied, but they are a minor feature.

The historical approach is represented by a number of fine textbooks in the field, some of which make excellent reference books. Without being specific I may note that the histories of Hebrew literature frequently use this technique; and like their counterparts in our own field, are not always inspirational as texts. This approach, then, though valuable for a student majoring in Bible, may be dismissed

³New York: Nelson & Co., 1939.

as not the most satisfactory one for a teacher of English. It covers too much ground.

Some variants of this plan for the Bible course, as indicated by recent texts, certainly have value in the hands of a skilled teacher, though their general tendency is to subordinate the literary elements of the Bible because of their interest in other matters. A good example of what I mean is Professor Carl S. Knopf's *The Old Testament Speaks*.⁴ Relying on archeology, geography, history, ethnology, and anthropology, the book is only incidentally concerned with the Bible as literature. Professor Knopf writes in his preface: "The purpose of this volume is to direct the student through the Bible; to throw light on the Bible; to arouse interest in the Bible. . . . From this study should emerge a working continuity of Hebrew history, an appreciation of Hebrew literature, a proper concept of Israel's religion, a personal acquaintance with the prophets and sages, and a clearer understanding of specific Old Testament books.

"Ideally a study of the Old Testament should lead the student to the mountain peaks of great religious experience where, thinking it over in the presence of the noble men of God or in company with noble books, he too should share the glory of life that has come close to God."

Admirable as such an ideal for Bible study certainly is, I must hasten to add that to use the approach suggested by Professor Knopf's remarks, one needs much more preparation than the average professor of English can boast. And the approach outlined, while it has much in its favor, belongs in a department of Bible or of religion.

Another variant of this approach, with emphasis on the ethnological and anthropological phases of Bible study, is found in the excellent work of Professor Harold H. Watts, whose course in the English department at Purdue University is justly famous. Professor Watts, in an article in *College English* for March, 1948, and in the preface to his recent book, *The Modern Reader's Guide to the Bible*⁵ has explained in detail his ideas about the elective Bible course in an English department and how it should be presented. They may be summarized here briefly. Professor Watts in his article lists five things to be done by the teacher of Bible: 1) habituate the student to Hebrew rhetoric, 2) give the student some acquaintance with the "laws" of

⁴ New York: Nelson & Co., 1934.

⁵ New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.

folklore as they operate in the Bible, 3) give the student some of the relation of Hebrew history to ancient world history, 4) make the student perceive how slow was the accretion and transmission of the key concepts which are still important, and 5) perhaps help the student "perceive that a natural miracle is involved in the emergence of the key-concepts in a certain distant civilization." Earlier in his paper, Professor Watts remarked that "the approach [to the Bible] often suggests that the Bible is simply one among many good books and that, indeed, it has no pre-eminent claim to a central place in Western Culture, of which the 'American Way' is but a special adjustment and continuation." He thinks that the teacher of Bible should attempt to "convince college students that the Bible is an important element in our way of life and that it deserves that importance. . . ." Such a process, he goes on, "involves more than a display of the quaintness and beauty in which the King James translation is rich. One's task is to convince students that the scriptures have contributed largely to our stock of professed beliefs." In the preface to his excellent and reliable *Guide*, he continues the same vein of thinking. After dismissing the purely literary, the cultural history and the "comparative religion approaches to Bible study" as incomplete, he concludes: "It is the intention of this guide to give an exact, continuous description of this gap (between the Bible and other books) . . . that sets the Scriptures apart from other bodies of literature. It will be obvious to readers that the writer does not ignore what literary taste, ethnology, archeology, and the other disciplines tell us about the Bible."

In the hands of a properly trained and skilled teacher, Professor Watts' methods would produce excellent results; and his article as well as his preface contains many wise observations for teachers of Bible courses. I merely observe in all humility that I do not feel capable of presenting a course in the Bible from the multiple points of view he proposes. I may add that for the average member of my craft, I believe the approach is not the best one. Personally I prefer not to teach *about* the Bible, but to teach the Bible itself as a great literary work.

Having presented the religious and historical approaches mentioned in the preface of the New Testament from which I quoted, I come to the third one noted, the "Bible as a classic of English literature." Without apology for the pun, I must say that for a teacher of English, this is the classical approach. The majority of courses in the survey

bore titles which indicated that it is also the approach most favored. Professor Wilbur O. Sypherd's succinct little manual, *The Literature of the English Bible*⁶ presents clearly the literary approach of which I am speaking. "The purpose of this book," he writes, "is to provide adequate material for an intelligent reading and study of the Bible as a part of English literature." Later he points out that the King James version of 1611 is the only one which "deserves the distinction of being regarded as a part of English literature . . . an enduring classic. . . ." In his clear statement of purpose, and in his reliance upon the King James version of 1611, Professor Sypherd speaks, I believe, for many of his colleagues in other English departments. For reasons already noted earlier in this paper, I feel that a teacher of English is most at home and most capable as a teacher of Bible when he tries to make it come alive as literature. For this purpose, I favor a types course organized insofar as possible chronologically. The literary approach is not without excellent texts, some new, some old. It is not the province of this paper to survey this richly cultivated field, but two may be mentioned as good examples; they are: Professor Laura Wild's *Literary Guide to the Bible*⁷ and Professor Mary Ellen Chase's delightful *The Bible and the Common Reader*.⁸

That the literary approach to the Bible offers a wide scope for the study of types of literature, especially in the Old Testament, needs no proof of mine. But I would observe that the teacher who does not add to his discussion of literary types some evidence of his appreciation of their religious values has not fulfilled his obligation to his material. The main purpose of the course, however, may be stated simply and definitely: *to get students to read the Bible intelligently.*

Never far distant in the discussions and lectures in my course is the basic principle that we are studying a great literary monument, written by an ancient people who seem to have learned from their bitter and inspiring experiences how to express the feeling deep in each human breast that man is not alone in this vale of tears, and that their inspired writings have so influenced the course of history that we reckon time from the birth of their greatest teacher, follow their customs in many of the most important areas of our society, and, with words from their pens, are put into our graves.

⁶ New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

⁷ New York: Harper & Brothers, 1933.

⁸ New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944.

When the American army occupied Japan, Japanese leaders, surprised and relieved at the mild and benevolent rule of General MacArthur's Military Government, inquired the reason for this behavior of the conquerors. The reply they received was that Americans are Christians and attempt to go by the rules laid down in the Bible. "Give us," cried the Japanese, "that book. We need it for our people." The result was that several millions of Bibles have been distributed in Japan since 1946, that the Japanese are studying this book fervently, introducing it into their university curricula, and taking it to their hearts. It still has the power to transform lives, to make civilizations.

When I turn from that bright picture to our own country, and look, as I have been doing recently, even at one small segment of our collegiate education, I am not hopeful. Yes, we have courses in the Bible; but they are not often recommended, and certainly are not overly popular. Six or seven sections are required to meet our demands for business letter writing at the University of North Carolina; one suffices for Bible. Playwriting has expanded into a department, and students clamor to take courses in radio production. Frankly, I wonder if we are not neglecting the vital for the superficial elements of a liberal education. We are tithing the mint and the cummin and have left undone the greater matters. For upon us as teachers of English rests a great responsibility in this matter of Bible study, and a great challenge. We should resolve first, that we will do what we can as advisers and administrators to try to reduce the Bible illiteracy of this generation by making adequate opportunities in our college curricula for the study of the Bible; second, that, in keeping with the great majority of American colleges, we will promote and encourage the teaching of the Bible; and, finally, that we will, by encouraging the establishment of courses in the Bible in departments of English, do whatever is possible to restore this classic of our literature to its rightful place among humanistic studies.

Survey of the Use of the Grade "Incomplete" and Other Grades to Indicate Courses Not Completed During the Semester of Registration

RICHARD L. TUTHILL

OVER a period of time the grade "I" (incomplete) has taken on varied meanings. It is probable that the original intent of such a grade was the literal meaning of the word "incomplete", and that the grade was given for reasons deemed good and sufficient by the individual instructor. But there are numerous reasons for incompleteness, many of which have no relevancy to the particular course. Often it is some misadventure on the part of the student which results in the grade "I" being given; on occasion student procrastination is the true reason for the work not being completed.

The use of the "I" grade seems to be on the increase—possibly legitimately so, for students are under many pressures which curtail their output of work. None the less, the mark is being interpreted in some quarters to the detriment of the student. Copies of the permanent records of students now go to many types of individuals and organizations: business, government and academic; too many "I"s create the suspicion of student procrastination. To be sure, most institutions have a time limit within which the incomplete must be removed, but many records stand with numerous "I"s. Few institutions have rules which convert this grade to something else after the time limit has passed.

But what of the technically correct "incomplete" grade? Suppose that through no fault of the student the course is not completed. Suppose the topic investigated or the problem undertaken or the materials available do not allow for completion within the semester or quarter. Should this student be stigmatized in any degree on his record, since he cannot control the outside interpretation which may be placed on the grade of "I"? Should there not be some other grade which will indicate more accurately the reason for not completing the course?

Recently at the University of Kentucky a committee of three from the Graduate School undertook to investigate this problem at the grad-

uate level. It was noted that on the campus there were numerous courses in research, independent work and seminar which were of a continuing nature; that often the topic, project or problem could not and should not be completed within one semester; and that both staff and students were aware of and resented the grade of "I" to indicate the past endeavor and present status of work. It was agreed by the committee that its concern would be confined to determining the extent of the use of a different grade to be applied to graduate courses only; that an investigation of the misuse of the grade "I" was not a function of the committee; and that any change or new grade should be confined to courses involving research, independent work and continuing seminar.

The method consisted of sending to a selected group of colleges and universities a double postal card questionnaire. The response was amazingly satisfactory and many indications were received that the problem was not confined to the University of Kentucky.

Four questions were asked:

- (1) Do you have a grade, symbol, or word used both on the permanent record and on reports to students at the end of the semester, which indicates that a course has not been completed for reasons of insufficient time rather than any procrastination or misfortune on the part of the student? YES () No ()
- (2) If "Yes" what grade, symbol or word is recorded? _____
- (3) Is the grade, symbol or word applicable to undergraduate as well as graduate courses? YES () NO ()
- (4) In what ways, if at all, is the use of this grade, symbol or word limited? _____

The following summary records the answers received from 107 institutions out of 125 to whom questionnaires were sent.

Question One: 107 answers

Yes: 81 No: 26

Question Two: 107 answers

No Grade: 26

Incomplete ("I" or "Inc"): 45

Grade other than Incomplete: 36

Question Three: 107 answers

Graduate level only: 13

Both graduate and undergraduate: 46

No report: 48

Question Four: 107 answers

Time restriction: 16

Quality of work restriction: 10

No report: 81

A comment with reference to questions three and four is in order. The forty-seven institutions not replying to question three include twenty-six who use no grade and therefore would not reply. Most of the forty-six using the same grade for both graduate and undergraduate courses are institutions using "Inc." or "I".

With reference to question four it is felt the questionnaire was not filled out for various reasons. The principal deduction to be made is that many institutions using a grade other than "Inc." usually protect it by placing a time limit on its use and by stating that at the time the grade is given the student must be making satisfactory progress.

As noted above, thirty-five institutions use a grade more specific than and different from "incomplete." There seems to be little unanimity, however, in the selection of the alternative grade. In approximately half of the institutions reporting, restrictions on the use of the grade were stated. Such restrictions involved either the time within which the grade must be removed, or the quality of work at the time the grade was given. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of those not reporting restrictions actually protect the use of the grade in some way.

The grades other than "I" and "Inc" and the number of institutions using each grade are as follows:

"S" (satisfactory progress)	7
"Def" (deferred)	5
"P" or "Pr" (progress)	3
"W" or "WH" (withheld)	3
"X"	3
"IP" (in progress)	2
"N"	3
"O"	2
"Del" (delayed), "E" (extended), "G", "J", "NR" (no record), "T", "#", "—"	1 each

As a result of this survey the Graduate School of the University of Kentucky will utilize both the grade of "I" (incomplete) and "S"

(satisfactory work in progress). The rules governing the use of these grades are self-explanatory and are verbatim as follows:

A mark of "I" (incomplete) may be assigned to a graduate student who for any reason has failed to complete his course work. In order to have an "I" converted into a final passing grade he must, except in special circumstances, complete the work within one calendar year after the close of the term in which the "I" was assigned. No student may graduate with "Incomplete" marks on his record without permission of his adviser and approval of the Dean of the Graduate School.

A mark of "S" (satisfactory work in progress) may be recorded for students in graduate courses of research, independent work, or seminar type, if at the end of a semester the student, because of the nature or size of the project, has been unable to complete the course. The grade may not be given to a student who has done unsatisfactory work or to one who has failed to do a reasonable amount of work. The project must be substantially continuous in its progress. If the student ceases working on the project for as much as one year, the grade of "S" shall automatically be converted to "E."

The grade of "S" is not applicable to undergraduate courses. The grade of "I" with a thirty-day limit after the date of next registration of the student receiving such a grade continues in use for undergraduate courses.

Editorial Comment

Correction Versus Change of Final Marks

THE RESPONSIBILITY of the records officer is to maintain complete and accurate records and to promote faculty-student respect for final marks.

Provision must be made to permit an instructor to correct a mark if he made an error in computing or recording it. Permission dare not be given to an instructor to change a mark because of "possible misjudgment," or allied reasons.

Doing the following will help you meet your responsibilities as defined above.

1. Send with the examination schedule and calendar of end-of-term events for use by both faculty and students a concise statement of the regulations for submitting final marks, a definition of each mark, and a statement of the exact hour and day when the books close for all courses or for blocks of courses. Adhere to these rules whether requests for exceptions come from faculty members or students.
2. Handle each request for correction of mark yourself. Assure the instructor that the procedure you have set up is to make certain that no one will ever have cause to question the validity of the change. Have him present evidence that a computational or recording error was made, and have him certify by his signature on the corrected class card that a routine re-check of his records would have prompted him to request a correction, the same as a re-check resulting from the request of a student.
3. Indicate on the notice of a change of mark that is sent to the student, the dean, and others that the change is the result of a correction of mark by the instructor.
4. Counsel with instructors who ask about the possibility of changing a mark because of "possible misjudgment" or allied reasons. Frequently they are inexperienced instructors who are having their first experience of being asked questions about a mark by someone, as for example a parent, an alumnus, or a student who is a member of an influential campus group. Usually these instructors come to you for reassurance rather than with the hope of being able to change a mark. You are in a position to give them guidance.

R. E. M.

In the Office

A Note on Determination of Year-Ranks for S.S.S. Form 109

J. D. LEITH

Determination of semesterly (or quarterly) class rankings of students, on the basis of their term averages, for institutional purposes, is a procedure long familiar to registrars. S.S.S. Form 109 now calls for certification of composite year-rankings. This note compares two methods of obtaining such rankings and undertakes to show that the first method may admit intolerable misrepresentation, while the second method is defensible and at the same time somewhat simpler in application.

Consider a student whose ranks for the first and second semesters of his academic year are represented by

$$R_1 = \frac{N_1}{D_1} \quad \text{and} \quad R_2 = \frac{N_2}{D_2}$$

where, in general, rank R means that the student 'ranked N among D full-time male students in his class,' in the language of Form 109.

Method I

This employs the simple, but possibly deceptive, unweighted average of semester-ranks to obtain the year-rank, with

$$Y_1 \equiv \frac{R_1 + R_2}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{N_1}{D_1} + \frac{N_2}{D_2} \right).$$

If $D_1 = D_2$, no problem arises; if $D_1 \neq D_2$, serious consequences may follow, as illustrated by the following examples:

- (1) If $R_1 = 1/2$ and $R_2 = 30/100$, then $Y_1 = 40/100$, but
- (2) If $R_1 = 2/2$ and $R_2 = 30/100$, then $Y_1 = 65/100$.

In one case (1), the student is in the upper half of his class, but in the lower half in the other case (2). This possibly critical difference is not in fact due to any real change in the student's relative performance level, but is primarily a consequence of the method employed, whereby a relatively meaningless change in R_1 is given improper

weighting with the result that the composite rank Y_I is warped far from essential 'truth.'

Method II

Consider the following definition of another year-rank in terms of the same elements:

$$Y_{II} = \frac{N_1 + N_2}{D_1 + D_2}.$$

Apply this definition to the data of examples (1) and (2):

(3) If $R_1 = 1/2$ and $R_2 = 30/100$, then $Y_{II} = 31/102 = 15.5/51$, but

(4) If $R_1 = 2/2$ and $R_2 = 30/100$, then $Y_{II} = 32/102 = 16/51$.

(The last step in each case is a mere down-scaling brought about by dividing numerator and denominator (each) by 2; the resulting 51 is a better base indicator of the size of the year-group within which the composite ranking has meaning than is the arbitrarily chosen 100 in the Y_I computation; note that there would be equally good logical ground for using 2 as the base figure for the Y_I determination!)

The point of Examples (3) and (4) is that Y_{II} is only slightly affected (as it seems evident it should be only slightly affected) by the relatively meaningless change in R_1 . This student is in the upper half of his year-class in each case.

Admittedly these are extreme examples, with data selected to exhibit the inherent flaw in Method I. But the flaw exists, and only in lesser degree are less extreme examples affected in cases of relatively smaller differences between the base numbers.

Application of the Y_{II} definition having been exemplified, we may proceed to a theoretical justification of Method II. Let us agree to weight R_1 and R_2 according to the base-group population figures D_1 and D_2 , respectively; add the results, and divide by the sum of the weights (according to the familiar operation regularly used for determination of semester averages). Then,

$$\frac{(D_1) R_1 + (D_2) R_2}{D_1 + D_2} = \frac{(D_1) \frac{N_1}{D_1} + (D_2) \frac{N_2}{D_2}}{D_1 + D_2} = \frac{N_1 + N_2}{D_1 + D_2},$$

which latter is precisely the expression given in the definition advanced above for Y_{II} . We note that down-scaling, by dividing the

numerator and denominator (each) by 2, does not affect the relative rank indication, but does provide a more nearly satisfactory indicated base figure than would be given by $D_1 + D_2$ or by either D_1 or D_2 arbitrarily chosen. (Unless D_1 and D_2 happen to be equal, any single figure is 'fictitious'.)

Extension of the argument from the two-semester basis to the three-quarter basis follows readily to yield

$$Y_{II} = \frac{N_1 + N_2 + N_3}{D_1 + D_2 + D_3},$$

with desirable down-scaling to be accomplished thereafter by dividing numerator and denominator (each) by 3.

Book Reviews

S. A. N.

Havemann, Ernest & West, Patricia Salter, *They Went to College*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952. Pp. v + 277.

This book is based on a recent survey by *Time* Magazine. Its purpose is to give an authentic picture of the American college graduate. To find such a picture of 6,000,000 graduates from our 1,300 institutions of higher learning was obviously not easy, but the findings are offered in a most readable and interesting manner. The composite picture of the graduate was arrived at from studying a sampling which included 9,064 individuals, made up by securing a list of all graduates whose names begin with "Fa"; to these a thirteen-page questionnaire was sent, with a 59 per cent response. The material was analyzed by the Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research under the leadership of Dr. Patricia Salter West and written up by Ernest Havemann.

A number of generalizations based on the findings include the following:

(1) The college graduate, as a type, is distinguished by his youth (there are many more young people than old). (2) Three out of four are men. (3) Birthplace has probably played a large part in the chances for going to college, with seven graduates out of ten coming from the East or Midwest. Only one in ten grew up on a farm. (4) The chances are good that the college graduate comes from a college family. (5) Contrary to popular belief, 71 per cent earned their way through college either in whole or in part.

The picture of the male college graduate shows that he is well off financially and a family man. Not only is he more apt to be married, but more apt to stay married than the noncollege man. The picture of the college woman graduate does not present as successful a financial record as the man's although she has done better than the noncollege woman. Matrimonially, approximately one out of every three women graduates is unmarried, or 31 per cent as compared with 13 per cent unmarried women among the population as a whole.

Other phases of the complete picture have to do with careers, jobs, prestige, political views, international views, racial tolerance, religion, choice of college.

The book is brimful of all kinds of findings, quotations from actual letters, and conclusions, drawn from the material available. Some common

pet ideas and opinions about the modern college graduate are challenged and are not supported by this study; but after all, that's part of the fun. There is much of interest to the registrar in this well written book, and it is worth a careful study.

GRETCHEN M. HAPP
The Principia
Elsab, Illinois

Brownell, Baker, *The College and the Community*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. Pp. 248.

At least half of Baker Brownell's book, *The College and the Community*, is a sharp criticism of higher education in the United States. Much of this criticism we have heard before: that colleges are sanctuaries, unrealistic in their preparation of students for life outside; that they are too much concerned with the concept of individual success, not enough with community or family centered careers; that they serve as avenues of escape, channeling students from their home communities to urban centers.

It is to the latter criticism that Mr. Brownell gives most of his attention in *The College and the Community*. Colleges, he says, have turned their backs on the "little places." They have become an extractive industry—processing youth, giving them degrees, removing them from their native places, marketing them elsewhere. Since he looks upon the small community as the matrix of human activities, the primary group wherein the only real values are created, he naturally looks with alarm upon the depopulation of rural areas and the migration to the cities.

Mr. Brownell's remedy for this migration and for all the other ills of the colleges is to take the college to the community through "mobile" units. He presents a strong case for higher education within the small community and within the "occupational context" of the student. More than this, he presents a carefully thought out plan by which the mobile college might be made to work.

What's wrong with the colleges is an old story, but it has never been written in more colorful and vigorous language than is in this book. Here is a sample:

Until the deans and faculty members get over the idea that they are nostalgic angels bringing cultural messages from some fairer time or place where intellect and beauty have a higher status than in the villages and alfalfa fields at home, they will continue to have a functional and aesthetic value not unlike the cast-iron roses on the front of Aunt Martha's cookstove.

The College and the Community should be read and pondered. It will

cause argument. It may even blast a few of the more complacent faculty members and administrators out of the comfortable *status quo*.

NATALIE CALDERWOOD

The University of Kansas

Rogers, Francis M., *Higher Education in the United States*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1952. Pp. 54.

The ten chapters covering various aspects of higher education in the United States is, so the author tells us, in his preface, "a revised English version of a series of lectures originally written in Portuguese and delivered in Brazil in 1950, under the auspices of the United States Department of State." I am told that this material is also being made available in pamphlet form in several foreign languages all over the world by the Department of State.

No one can doubt that Dean Rogers achieves admirably what he set out to do—"give a summary view of higher education in the United States." This is by no means an easy task, and to have done so in less than fifty pages is a remarkable accomplishment. Doubtless the best way to give the reader a proper view of the contents of this book is to list the chapter headings. They are as follows: I. The Basic Philosophy of Higher Education in the United States. . . . II. The Organization of an American University. . . . III. Student Life in American Colleges and Universities. . . . IV. Curriculum Problems in American Liberal-Arts Colleges. . . . V. Personnel Problems in American Higher Education. . . . VI. The Financing of Higher Education in the United States. . . . VII. Professional Training in American Colleges and Universities. . . . VIII. The University Library in the United States. . . . IX. Inter-university Organization in the United States. . . . X. American Colleges and Universities and International Student Exchange.

Dean Rogers does not let his personal views intrude into his discussions and thus he presents a fair and unbiased account of the educational system in the United States beyond the secondary level. An excellent diagram on page three entitled, "Relationship of Educational Institutions in the United States" will give the reader a clear, visual appreciation of how our system of higher education works. Reproduction of eight photographs from the campuses of as many colleges and universities, add to the usefulness of the book and the index (pp. 51-54) is a great help to the reader.

This book will be exceedingly valuable to the foreign student who contemplates coming to the United States to study. It is to be hoped that all colleges and universities will send a copy of it to every student from

another land whom they admit, and it should be available in every library. It will be a standard volume in its field for many years to come.

WM. MARION MILLER
Miami University

Johnson, B. Lamar, *General Education in Action*, Washington: American Council on Education, 1952. Pp. xxvi + 409.

General Education in Action is a report of the California study of general education in the junior college, made during 14 months in 57 California public junior colleges. There is an introduction by U. S. Commissioner of Education Earl J. McGrath.

The report starts in a way to deserve commendation: it outlines clearly just what is meant in the report by the phrase *general education*; on that foundation it quotes opinions of various authorities as to the necessity of general education. There is a minimum of fuzziness, and a gratifying emphasis on the development of the individual *per se*, as well as of the individual as a member of society. The discussion of the goals of general education leaves no doubt in the reader's mind as to what is meant, although it is possible to dissent from some of the opinions presented.

There are various approaches to general education, on which the report is perhaps a bit wordy; and there is discussion of advising, guidance, counseling, and psychology and personal adjustment. Unlike many such discussions, this one is based on what is done in the California junior colleges. It is pleasing to observe that not all the junior colleges follow any one method, and that there is no advocacy that they should.

Chapters on health, physical education, and recreation; family life education; communication; the creative arts and the humanities; the natural sciences and mathematics; vocational courses; and citizenship and the social studies are again all based on what is sought and what is done in the various junior colleges. Especially worthy of attention is the chapter on the creative arts and the humanities, topics on which there is a great deal of fairly pointless talk nowadays, and a great deal of vagueness. The report explains what is meant by these terms, and goes on to show why the creative arts and the humanities are good "practical" fields of endeavor, and what is being done in the California colleges to establish them usefully.

Extraclass programs, administration, and library administration are fully discussed, again always on a factual basis. And even the last chapters, on the problems and opportunities of the future, are free from either nebulous notions or jargon.

One who reads the report through can only be gratified that there is

so consistent and so vigorous an effort in California to make of junior college education a genuine education, even in the technical subjects and vocational programs. It is also gratifying to have at hand so comprehensive a study of what is actually being done in general education in the state which has carried junior college education farther than any other. There is a great deal of valuable material in the report for all those who work in and with junior colleges; but beyond that there is much that is valuable to every one who is active in education anywhere. California is to be congratulated.—Not that there are no shortcomings: there are, and the report considers them. By and large, however, the report is a matter for congratulation to the state, and also to the people involved in making the study, from Mr. Johnson to the students in the colleges.

The California junior colleges are trying to do a big job and a good one. The fact that the job is so big leads one to wonder what the high schools have been doing—something that has often been wondered before. The junior colleges have a program in communications, for example, in which they attempt to get their students to read, write, listen, and speak well. Yet why should high school graduates not already know how to do these things if they are ever going to be able to? Why should they learn to be grammatical only after they have got to college? Why should they not already know how to speak, listen, read, write? What have they been doing all those years in school, especially in their English courses?

Why should young people go to college to learn elementary arithmetic, the rudiments of biology, family life, or personal health? Many of those who enter college already know such things—and the California junior colleges try to arrange programs suited to the educational status of those who enter with such knowledge. But why should not all students enter college competent in such elementary matters? What have they been doing? What have their teachers been doing? What have the teachers of their teachers been doing?

These questions have been asked often enough; but to read such a report as this one emphasizes again the appalling waste in many of our schools—waste of time, waste of energy and good humor, and (what might make a difference to many citizens) waste of tax money. The junior colleges, like other colleges, try to do what should have been done long before; and doing this, they are not able to do what might be more worth while for students of college age, and make better use of taxpayers' money.

As a report on what junior colleges are doing and trying to do, the report is stimulating and encouraging. As a revelation of what has to be done, it is gloomy, quite without intending to be so.

In one other way the report is perhaps unintentionally revealing: it

gives a pretty sound basis for arguing that general education, valuable—indispensable—as it is, does not and cannot do what a liberal education is intended to do. It takes more time than a junior college has, no doubt, to give a liberal education; nor are junior colleges alone in not giving one. A general education gives a great deal of firsthand material to deal with, and shows ways and means of dealing with it.

A liberal education, on the other hand, is—was, at any rate—calculated to fit a person to deal with materials familiar and common, but also with matters not yet so much as conceived of. It served to develop intellectual detachment, and to put into students' hands the vicarious experience of humanity. It sought to show a man or a woman what has been known, and what has been done about it; but also to fit every individual to meet what has not been guessed at, to evaluate it in the light of human experience, and to take competent steps to deal with it.

One of the serious omissions in the California plan, it would seem, is neglect of biography, for biography is one way to develop the ability to exercise a free mind. The omission, however, is not peculiar to California colleges: one must wonder when we shall understand our great men, and let them guide us.

This last is a criticism not of the report or of California, but of the idea that general education is "the same thing" as liberal education, with hard thinking left out. The California job is a fine one, and the report on it is admirable.

Turngren, Annette, *Choosing the Right College*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952. Pp. viii + 149.

A brief, sensible, and generally sufficient little book of advice to high school students about the value of college education, finding out about colleges, and making decisions about application. Kinds of colleges, suitable institutions for various careers, financial matters, and social possibilities are all treated briefly but reasonably and well.

Since so many high school students are unable to find many of the works of reference on colleges which are mentioned and recommended in the text, the book would be much more valuable to a large number of prospective college students if there were a succinct check list of leading colleges and universities, with more mention of their special fields of instruction.

Connelly, Thomas R., *The Registrar*, Newark, N.J.: Washington Irving Publishing Co., 1952. Pp. 83.

This little paper-bound book is too elementary to be of much use to the profession. However, since it is correct in its simplicity, it may, as the author hopes, "prove to be of interest and informative to trustees, councils,

other administrative officers, faculty members, neophytes in the field, students of higher education, and others who may be interested in the registrar's office."

McVey, Frank L., and Hughes, Raymond M., *Problems of College and University Administration*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1952. Pp. xiii + 326.

Two esteemed former college presidents, each of whom acted as president of two institutions, sit down to talk it over. This book is a collection of brief discussions on a great variety of administrative problems, each essay initialed to show the author. The two men are not always in agreement, but they are seldom far apart in their interpretations.

Most of the discussion is practical and down-to-earth, but nevertheless affable and interesting. It is full of good advice from two men who know what they are talking about, and know what it means. Although intended, perhaps, for other presidents primarily, it is full of sound ideas for others in the academic profession.

There are sections of discussion on The New President, The President and the Trustees, Problems of Administration, The Campus, The President and the Faculty, The Status of Students, The President and the Alumni, The Importance of Teaching, Graduate Work and Research, and College Chapel, the Library, and Other Matters. Presidents McVey and Hughes have lent a vigorous helping hand!

The chapters on the registrar and the admissions officer, incidentally, read as if they had been written many years ago. What is there advocated has become so much a part of procedure in most institutions that to read these pages is a step back into earlier times. It was good advice once; but has long since been taken, added to, and put into practice.

Charters, W. W., *Opportunities for the Continuation of Education in the Armed Forces*, Washington: ACE, 1952. Pp. xii + 72.

Six subcommittees, and then an Evaluation Study Committee examined the total course offerings of USAFI, and made specific evaluations and suggestions. This report does not include these evaluations and suggestions, which have been sent on to USAFI. Nevertheless, along with a report on the offerings of USAFI, there are some recommendations here in the last section of the report, Planning for the Future.

The first section, Facts about USAFI, explains the nature of the organization, the characteristics of the students, and use of courses. In the second section, Materials and Instruction, is a general discussion of instruction, but not a catalogue of courses.

Of most interest to admissions officers and registrars, presumably, is

part 5 of the first section, Attitudes toward USAFI, in which a great many questions are given, with answers that have been assembled. Likewise of interest are the specific recommendations given at the end. The booklet should be of increasing value in the months to come.

McMillen, Wayne, *Statistical Methods for Social Workers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952. ix + 564 pp. \$6.75.

In the "Foreword" and "Introduction," Mr. McMillen documents the growing importance of and need for statistical manipulation and presentation of data in the various fields and levels of social work. His job, as he conceives it, is to write an introductory text book which "deals with the field of descriptive statistics" with such clarity and simplicity that social workers having little familiarity with statistics can understand it and be better qualified to carry out their obligations to their agencies and to the "taxpaying and contributing public." Since the author chooses to cover only part of what is generally treated in an introductory book on statistics, the distinction must be made between descriptive and inductive statistics.

Whether or not one considers the distinction between "descriptive" and "inductive statistics" a valid one, there is agreement concerning the statistical methods that fall under each of these headings. "Descriptive statistics" concerns itself with the problem of reducing a mass of data into meaningful order or form through the use of frequency distributions, graphs, ratios, rates, percentages, measures of central tendency, measures of dispersion, time series, and index numbers, as well as some of the measures of relationship. "Descriptive statistics" is concerned only with the representation of the data at hand and does not generalize beyond these data. The data are treated as a universe rather than as a sample of a larger universe. It is this part of general statistics that Mr. McMillen says he is going to handle.

The other division of general statistics, called "inductive statistics," uses many of the summary measures of "descriptive statistics," but treats the data that are so summarized as a sample drawn from some larger defined universe. Through the use of "descriptive statistics" we can establish the true value for the sample, but when this value is applied to the universe from which the sample is drawn, such precision is impossible and new problems arise. To meet these problems additional theory and an elaborate body of statistical methods ("inductive statistics") have been developed. These would include probability theory, techniques for drawing representative samples, tests of sample representativeness, measures of "error," levels of significance, and confidence or fiducial limits. So long as we limit our conclusions to the data studied we use "descriptive statistics." When we generalize about the universe from which the sample

is drawn we use "inductive statistics." Only briefly, in his very short chapter on sampling, does Mr. McMillen touch upon this important area of statistics. The author justifies this slight by saying that "Social agencies commonly make less use of inductive statistics than of the other major branch of the subject, which is usually called 'descriptive statistics'" (p. 5). "Inductive statistics," including theory and methods, has undergone a marked development in the social sciences in the last few decades, particularly in the area of small sample analysis. There are those who will be disturbed to find this partial treatment of statistics called *Statistical Methods for Social Workers*.

Within the limits which the author sets for himself, he does an excellent job. One of his strong points is his concern, which pervades the work, for accurate communication between the agency and the "taxpaying and contributing public." Suggestions are given, with examples, of how to translate the more difficult statistical expressions into lay English without distortion. The reader is often warned about the false impressions which can easily be created through poorly chosen increments on the x and y axes of a graph, through the use of pictograms where changes in the size of the figures are used to represent changes in the amounts of a variable, through the use of a poorly located break on the y axis, etc. An honorable job honorably done.

Another avowed purpose of the author, the achieving of clarity and simplicity, has been remarkably well realized. Little if any statistical knowledge is assumed and *all* concepts and symbols are carefully defined when they first appear. Each problem or method is handled in considerable detail, with ample use of text to supplement the illustrated mathematical operations.

The outstanding chapters with respect to clarity, simplicity, and unusual attention to detail are the chapters on statistical tables and graphic representation. Many of the points are handled in standard texts, but rarely with such completeness. Some idea of this completeness may be gained if I list the points which the author covered in detail in his discussion of table construction: determination of suitable class intervals; wording of the title; location and content of foot and head notes; handling of estimated frequencies; location of totals and sub-totals (distinctions made between work and report tables); the handling of stubs, captions, and braces (their working, location, and order); the handling of "no report," "unknown," and "all other." These important matters are not handled in a dogmatic, non-compromising way; some are left open, others have many alternative methods suggested. There is no attempt to answer all questions for the last time.

Much of what has been said about the chapter on tables is equally true of the chapter on graphic presentation. The author devotes approximately

sixty pages or a seventh of the text material to a treatment of the construction and interpretation of graphs. In it he stresses simplicity, meaningfulness, and visual impact and appeal, giving unusually careful attention to the problem of avoiding possible false impressions. In such a complete treatment I was surprised to find neither the simple ruler method for smoothing a frequency distribution curve, nor an ecological base map or spot map illustrated and discussed. A weak point, pedagogically, is that the significance of the equation of the straight line did not appear until many chapters after the discussion of it.

Some of the relatively unusual added attractions are: an elementary section on the use of logarithms, a sizable section giving a clear presentation of semilogarithmic paper, an appendix devoted to a *complete* illustration of two methods of extracting square roots, fourteen appendices (one hundred pages) of social work data to be used in the problems for students given at the end of most of the chapters, and a concluding chapter on the preparation of agency reports and the making of studies.

There are some general criticisms to be made of the book as a whole, in addition to the few specific ones already made. For all its emphasis upon clarity and simplicity, the book suffers somewhat from lack of adequate summaries. Particularly lacking are *summaries* of the conditions under which different measures and methods are usually or most profitably used. It would have been very helpful if the characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages of such measures as mean, median, standard deviation, etc., had been *outlined* at the end of the section or chapter in which they are discussed. The pertinent information is all there, but the book runs on and on without enough differential emphasis or pointing up of the more salient facts.

The features which distinguish this statistics text from others at the same level of approach are: its limited coverage of the field; its thoroughness and simplicity in handling the area of "descriptive statistics," especially the graphs and tables; and its social work emphasis, most pronounced in the choice of data, in the special consideration given to the problems of communicating statistical material to the public, and in the final chapter on social work reports and studies. I am sure that social workers generally will welcome a book which is so complete in what is statistically most important to them and which uses data and language they can readily appreciate and understand. And as an outstanding introductory text in "descriptive statistics" it will be welcomed by many who have no connection with social work.

DAVID T. LEWIS
Department of Sociology
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Committee Reports*

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SERVICE TO OTHER UNITS OF THE INSTITUTION

General

In considering the areas in which the office of the Registrar can contribute to effective administration in an institution of higher education, the committee has taken into account the following considerations:

1. From a study of published opinion and in accord with common consent, the Registrar's functions, and therefore his opportunities for service, follow no rigid pattern. As stated in *COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY* (July 1949, p. 551), "The functions of a Registrar depend largely on the educational plans and policies of the institution of which he is a member and the practices in administrative organization. These vary widely among American colleges and universities. Consequently we can neither fix nor define these functions." Hence, the nature of a particular educational institution, whether complex or simple, will determine in large measure the nature and extent of the opportunities for service.

The committee therefore conceived its responsibility as not to establish a fixed pattern of norms or statutes which would apply to all types of administrative organization, but rather to indicate the range of possibilities. Obviously, not all the functions which are outlined in this report can be effected in every college or university; in many institutions, all are achieved; in others, only a few are accomplished because the personnel is engaged in routines less related to the usual concept of their responsibilities.

2. The committee has taken into account the fact that the Registrar in the modern concept of university organization is a key administrative officer; that he has the university-wide point of view, uncolored by self-interest in an individual unit (however laudable that may be in its proper sphere), and that he should be a member of all appropriate administrative and policy-making committees.

* Editor's Note: These reports should have been included in the July issue, but the first was not received before the printer's deadline, and the second was inadvertently omitted—for which our sincere apologies to Mr. McWhinnie and his committee.

Scope

The committee has considered the concept of service to be in the following general areas:

- I. Research
- II. Financial
- III. Instructional
- IV. Public Relations

I. Research

The AACRAO believes that scholarly research should not be restricted to instructional personnel alone, but that it is also a fundamental duty of good administration. Such research may well be instrumental in determining high level decision and policies. The range of research possibilities is indicated in part in the paragraphs, "Financial" and "Instructional," below. It is self-evident that the measure of the success of Registrar's office lies not merely in the nature of the reports which it prepares, but the extent to which these reports become useful tools in the achievement of better administration.

II. Finance

In the area of finance, a study of information readily available in the Registrar's office can be of assistance in the following ways:

A. SHORT RANGE PLANNING

- 1—estimate of tuition income
- 2—use of facilities to maximum advantage
- 3—study of teaching loads and course distribution to determine the need or justification for the employment of additional part-time instructional personnel

B. LONG RANGE PLANNING

- 1—development of a sound basis of estimating future enrollments by school, department, and courses
- 2—projection of enrollments
- 3—evaluation of facilities in light of long term enrollment trend
- 4—periodic re-evaluation of course offerings with regard to
 - a) cyclic scheduling
 - b) extension or curtailment of individual programs
 - c) elimination of duplicated courses

III. Instructional

- A. Determination of effects of standards of admission
 - 1—correlation between promise and performance.
- B. Study of the reasons causing "drop outs" with special attention to:
 - 1—curricula in which they occur;
 - 2—formulation of programs to reduce number of "drop outs."
- C. Analysis of grade distribution is invaluable to the areas of administration and supervision for the purpose of:
 - 1—evaluating the grading system, per se;
 - 2—determining the degree of adherence to the grading system by instructional staff;
 - 3—determining the relationship between the grades as earned and the quality of the student population involved;
 - 4—evaluation of the instructional standards of the institution.
- D. Co-ordination with Guidance and Admission:
 - 1—in making available data for diagnostic and achievement measurement;
 - 2—in periodic re-evaluation of admissions standards.
- E. Continuous follow-up and study of outcomes as an effective tool for evaluation of the educational program:
 - 1—proportion engaged in higher study;
 - 2—institutions to which they have gone, with studies of their records;
 - 3—success in professional licensing examinations;
 - 4—the relationship of the undergraduate program and grades earned in it, to success after graduation.

IV. Public Relations

Recognizing the fact that they do not exhaust the field of Public Relations, since this area can affect both directly and indirectly almost the entire financial and academic structure of an institution of higher education, the committee suggests the following possibilities:

- A. Identification and development of newsworthy material in co-operation with the general program of press releases.
- B. Development of proper attitudes in correspondence with prospective students and other segments of the institution's public.
- C. Objective evaluation of ability of one's institution to meet the special educational and vocational needs of an individual prospect.
- D. Recruitment:
 - 1—student progress reports to home principals;
 - 2—liaison with secondary school guidance officers;

- 3—representation at college choosing programs;
- 4—detailed data on sources from which student body is drawn:
 - a) geographical distribution;
 - b) distribution by schools;
 - c) quality distribution within schools;
 - d) departures from expected distribution geographically and by schools.

Respectfully submitted,
ALFRED D. DONOVAN, Seton Hall University
JOHN M. MULLINS, Columbia University
E. VINCENT O'BRIEN, Fordham University,
Chairman

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—
MEMORANDUM OF PURPOSE

The aim of the Committee on Professional Development is to promote and evaluate the professional effectiveness of AACRAO.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The Committee on Professional Development submits the Tuesday Panel Program as the first section of its report.* The Committee further reports to the members of AACRAO its reference to the Association Executive Committee for attention and possible action of recommendations concerning:

- A. Employment Service.
- B. Recruitment, Preparation and In-Service Training.
- C. Association Organization (Committee Structure).

A. *Employment Service*. It is suggested that

1. A letter be written to every college president in the country, acquainting him with our service.
2. We request and urge all Registrars to let us know when there is to be a vacancy in their own offices, either the head man or some other position in the office for which they would like the service of the Committee in replacement.
3. We give publicity through the Journal at frequent intervals to our Employment Service.
4. Our Service affiliate with a national organization in the em-

* COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY, XXVII, 4 (July, 1952), pp. 575-607.

ployment field such as the Association of Placement Counsellors.

B. Recruitment, Preparation and In-Service Training. It is recommended

1. That the President of the AACRAO notify all college and university presidents of the details of the program, seeking their co-operation in making it effective by:
 - a. Notifying a designated official, or committee of the AACRAO of (1) any students or staff members peculiarly qualified to undertake the recommended training and (2) of fellowships or scholarships available in the field of Registrar and Admissions Administration, in their respective institutions.
 - b. Acquainting Deans and Counsellors, with the type of training desirable and where the training of specialized type is available.
 - c. Urging their Registrars and Admissions Officers, and "top assistants" to take advantage of all "In-service Training" features offered by the AACRAO itself, and by the institutions encouraged to provide the training recommended by the Association.
2. That a brochure covering the Recruitment, Preparation, and In-Service Training programs be prepared by the AACRAO and distributed to staff members, counsellors, and students.

C. Association Organization (Committee Structure). It is recommended

That the Executive Committee designate some committee to review and re-evaluate the entire committee structure of AACRAO, looking to possible Association committee reorganization to avoid confusion and overlapping of assignments, to increase effectiveness, and to promote greater continuity and co-ordination.

Respectfully submitted,

R. E. McWHINNIE, *Chairman*
 IRENE M. DAVIS
 ELLEN L. DEERING
 J. E. FELLOWS

ELWOOD C. KASTNER
 JOHN M. RHOADS
 R. F. THOMASON
 RONALD B. THOMPSON

TREASURER'S REPORT, 1951-52

July 21, 1952

*The Executive Committee
American Association of Collegiate Registrars
and Admissions Officers*

GENTLEMEN:

We have made an examination of the cash receipts and disbursements as recorded on the books of the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1952.

All cash receipts as recorded on the books were traced to bank deposits for the year. We examined or accounted for all checks issued during the year and tested disbursements to invoices and vouchers.

Cash on deposit of \$11,490.22 at May 31, 1952 was reconciled with a certificate received direct from the bank. Petty cash funds totaling \$60.00 were held by the editor, treasurer and subscription manager. United States Treasury and Savings Bonds of \$7,200.00 were examined and all interest receivable during the year was accounted for. At May 31, 1952 there was a liability of \$36.00 for federal withholding tax deducted from April and May payrolls.

A fidelity bond covering the position of treasurer in the amount of \$5,000.00 was in force at May 31, 1952.

In our opinion, based upon our examination of the books and records of the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS, the accompanying statement presents fairly a summary of cash receipts and disbursements of the Association for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1952.

Very truly yours,

SWANSON OGILVIE & MCKENZIE
By ROY W. STOLLSTORF
Certified Public Accountant

GENERAL COMMENTS

Cash receipts for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1952 totaled \$19,865.20 and exceeded cash disbursements of \$12,996.01 by \$6,869.19, as summarized in Exhibit I. Cash and securities totaled \$18,714.22 at May 31, 1952.

A detailed statement of cash receipts and disbursements and comparison with the budget for the fiscal year, as prepared by the office of the treasurer, is shown in Exhibit II. We reviewed the distribution of receipts and disbursements to the various accounts and tested the accuracy of accumulating the detail.

At May 31, 1952, advertising income of \$450.00, subject to 15% discount, was receivable from advertisers in COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY. Advertising revenue is reflected in income when collected. We compared all advertising revenue for the fiscal year with copies of COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS
For the Fiscal Year Ended May 31, 1952

Cash and Securities at June 1, 1951

Cash in Bank	\$ 4,633.63	
Petty Cash Funds	60.00	
U. S. Treasury Bonds—At Cost—Par Value \$2,200.00 ...	2,200.00	
U. S. Savings Bonds—Series G—At Cost—Par Value \$5,000.00	5,000.00	
	<u>\$11,893.63</u>	
Less—Federal Withholding Tax Payable	48.60	\$11,845.03

Add—Receipts

Memberships—Renewal	\$17,975.00	
—New	725.00	\$18,700.00
Subscriptions	927.45	
Advertising	57.75	
Interest on U. S. Treasury and Savings Bonds	180.00	19,865.20
	<u> </u>	
Total		\$31,710.23

Deduct—Disbursements

General Administration	\$ 3,285.70	
1952 Convention—Washington, D.C.	1,288.64*	
Editor's Office	6,473.16	
Treasurer's Office	1,479.47	
Committee on Special Projects	1,590.45	
Committee on Office Forms	144.75	
Committee on Co-operation with Governmental Agencies	483.93	
Committee on Professional Development	501.18	
Committee on International Scholarships	154.83	
Committee on Regional Associations	58.68	
General Contingent Account	12.50	
American Council on Education Membership	100.00	12,996.01
	<u> </u>	

Cash and Securities at May 31, 1952 \$18,714.22

Consisting of

Cash in Bank	\$11,490.22	
Petty Cash Funds	60.00	
U. S. Treasury Bonds—At Cost—Par Value \$2,200.00	2,200.00	
U. S. Savings Bonds—Series G—At Cost—Par Value \$5,000.00	5,000.00	
	<u>\$18,750.22</u>	
Less—Federal Withholding Tax Payable	36.00	
	<u> </u>	
Net	<u><u>\$18,714.22</u></u>	

Cash and securities increased \$6,869.19 for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1952.

* Excess of convention receipts over disbursements.

Thirty-Ninth Annual AACRAO Convention in Minneapolis, April 20-23, 1953

The Radisson Hotel of Minneapolis has been chosen as the headquarters for the thirty-ninth Annual Convention of the AACRAO. Convention dates are April 20-23. Members are urged to mark their calendars now.

General Chairman True E. Pettengill has appointed the following committees for that convention. Chairmen and committee members will appreciate your suggestions for a profitable and enjoyable convention.

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEES

True E. Pettengill, General Chairman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Ted McCarrel, Marshal, University of Iowa, Iowa City

BANQUET

Claribelle B. Olson, Chairman, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota
Marshall Beard, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
William G. Bowling, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
D. B. Doner, South Dakota State College, Brookings
Clara Koenig, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Mary Lilleskov, St. Cloud Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
Samuel A. Nock, Pace College, New York, N.Y.
Edward B. Sheffield, Carleton College, Ottawa, Canada

CONVENTION NEWS

Howard B. Shontz, Chairman, University of California, Davis
Joseph C. Connor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
Gretchen M. Happ, The Principia, Elmhurst, Illinois
Nelson Parkhurst, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana
Kenneth W. Wegner, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota

EXHIBITS

Arthur M. Gowan, Chairman, Iowa State College, Ames
Vernon Ausen, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
S. Woodson Canada, University of Missouri, Columbia
Charles W. Edwards, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn
John M. Mullins, Columbia University, New York, New York
H. H. Pixley, Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan
Earl C. Seyler, University of Illinois, Urbana

HOSPITALITY AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ruby McKenzie, Chairman, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
H. W. Frankenfield, University of South Dakota, Vermillion
Katherine George, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Rev. Donald J. Gormley, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota
Harvey Hall, Stanford University, Stanford, California
J. Scott Hemry, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri
Howard W. Stepp, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

Ramon A. Vitulli, University of Houston, Houston, Texas
R. E. Summers, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Ronald B. Thompson, Chairman, Ohio State University, Columbus
Emma E. Deters, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York
True E. Pettengill, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

PUBLICITY PROMOTION AND PRESS RELATIONS

Ellsworth Gerritz, Chairman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
R. J. Bradley, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota
Edward G. Groesbeck, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Brother Leo, St. Marys College, Winona, Minnesota
William L. Mayer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh
Leonard G. Nystrom, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

REGISTRATION AND INFORMATION

Hazel Creal, Chairman, Rochester Junior College, Rochester, Minnesota
Marjorie M. Cutler, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado
Wendell R. Fuller, Still College, Des Moines, Iowa
Oliver C. Hagglund, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota
Noel Hubbard, Missouri School of Mines, Rolla
F. Taylor Jones, Drew University, Madison, New Jersey
Luella Reitan, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Kermit Smith, Michigan State College, Lansing

SECRETARIAL AND MIMEOGRAPH SERVICE

Inez Freyseth, Chairman, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota
Al Cox, Mankato Teachers College, Mankato, Minnesota
Mabel Fairchild, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Edwin Wenzel, University of Minnesota, Duluth

TOURS AND ENTERTAINMENT

Helen B. Pritchard, Chairman, Winona State Teachers College, Winona, Minnesota
Helen M. Frank, Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia
I. B. Hauge, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Richard Keefe, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri
Sister Helen Margaret, College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota
Judson P. Martin, Bemidji State Teachers College, Bemidji, Minnesota
Jean McCarthy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Reported to Us

A. H. P.

Colleges and Universities

A grant of \$10,000 a year for three years has been made by the New York Fund for Children to Barnard College to assist in financing a new program of courses in education to train undergraduates for teaching.

The University of Chicago and the Art Institute of Chicago will offer a joint program for the master of arts degree with each institution contributing its special resources to the new program.

To help students understand the relationships between religion and contemporary society, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., is offering a course in "Sociology of Religion" this fall. It will examine the theoretical and functional roles of religion in primitive and modern cultures from the standpoint of the social sciences.

A co-operative work-study program for majors in secretarial science, who will be enrolled for ten to twelve hours of classes in the College of Business Administration, will be administered at Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa. Students will be employed four hours a day for five days a week by business firms in the city.

The General Education Board has made a grant of seven million dollars for endowment to Emory University to strengthen graduate instruction and research.

Finch College, New York City, will offer courses leading to the degrees of B.A. and B.S. and will confer these degrees in addition to the junior-college degrees of Associate in Arts and Associate in Applied Science. The associate degrees will mark the completion of the junior-college courses.

A course in music appreciation open to the public without charge is offered at Fordham University, College of Arts and Sciences.

Seniors at Hamilton College, Clinton, New York, will be able to devote one-fifth of their curricular time to independent study in their chosen field. The students will meet at least once a week with a faculty tutor and will submit a written thesis at the end of the semester.

The new program for training educational administrators at the Harvard Graduate School of Education will stress field work in school systems and practice in making decisions and solving problems in actual administrative situations. The "case method" of teaching used in the Harvard Law School and the Harvard Business School will be used in the training of school administrators. The aim of the new program is to develop the master practitioner in the field of educational administration.

A diagnostic and remedial reading clinic, a new field of specialization in engineering, and a revised speech and drama curriculum have been introduced at Hofstra College.

With the establishment of the nation's first Institute for Research on Exceptional Children under the direction of Samuel A. Kirk, the University of Illinois will be ready to expand its research activities in behalf of both handicapped and gifted children in co-operation with the state's departments of Public Welfare and Public Instruction. The institute program will provide opportunities for training research workers in its area and to improve the effectiveness of the work of both public and private agencies for exceptional children, with new understanding of their problems and needs.

A new two-year program leading to the degree of Master of Business Administration will be offered at the University of Illinois, College of Commerce and Business Administration.

A new interdepartmental major, "School and Society," is offered at the University of Kansas for persons preparing to teach in the elementary schools.

A plan which authorizes changes in the structure of the Graduate School and also modifies policy requirements for graduate degrees has been approved by the University of Kentucky. The reorganization includes plans for the immediate enlargement of the graduate faculty on the basis of high professional attainment. The University has also adopted higher standards and improved procedures for admission to full graduate standing of those seeking advanced degrees.

Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., will use language laboratories to teach students to carry on conversations in foreign languages with intelligible pronunciation.

The entire income from the increase in the tuition fee at Lafayette College for the next academic year will be used to increase faculty salaries. The tuition fee will be increased from \$675 to \$750 for the year.

Long Island University has initiated a series of career conferences to give students a picture of job opportunities in their particular fields and to provide a guide for job preparation. At each of these sessions a panel of prospective employers gives its views on the qualifications that job applicants are expected to have.

A two-year curriculum study at Longwood College has proposed that elementary education majors be allowed to take a major in a field of their own choosing.

An Inter-American Seminar on Vocational Education was held at the University of Maryland from August 2 to September 6. The Seminar studied the problems of vocational education and training and pre-university technical education in agriculture, business, industry, and home economics in the American Republics. One hundred delegates from the Republics; observers from international organizations, chambers of commerce, teachers' associations, publishing houses, workers' organizations; and invited specialists attended the seminar which was sponsored by the Organization of American States, the U. S. Department of State, the International Labor Office, and the University of Maryland.

A Workshop in Intergroup Education at the University of Miami last summer was offered to provide rich resources and a stimulating environment for the study of patterns and problems of intergroup relations and for the acquiring of skill in educational techniques to promote understanding and respect among varying groups in the American culture.

The University of Michigan will offer a graduate program in journalism consisting of two years of specialized study followed by a year's internship on selected newspapers.

Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont, has expanded its fine arts department and will add to its curriculum a course dealing with the development of architecture, painting, and sculpture of Eastern art.

A program in journalism leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree has been authorized at the University of Minnesota.

Oberlin College, one of a group of colleges and universities sharing in the scholarship program of the George F. Baker Trust of New York City, has received another \$50,000 to continue the program for three more years.

Forty-five fellowships have been granted by the Radcliffe College Graduate Schools. Grants have been made to eight foreign students from France, Australia, England, Switzerland, China, and Canada.

St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, has opened a new Division of Nursing which will offer a four-year basic degree course in nursing.

A four-year curriculum in civil engineering will be added to the St. Louis University Institute of Technology beginning with the freshman class this fall. It is part of the University's program to extend the offerings of the Institute of Technology.

The State University's Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences in Brooklyn is offering two new courses, covering the culinary arts field and advertising-production management. A two-year college course in culinary arts and sciences has been approved and is being offered at the request of the Hotel Association and the American Culinary Federation. The advertising course is being introduced at the suggestion of the advertising industry.

A limited number of office-work scholarships valued at \$700 each have been made available by Stephens College for 1952-53. They are being offered to superior students who have a basic knowledge of typewriting and who can meet the standards of admission to the College. Under the plan, scholarship students will take two-thirds (11-12 semester hours) of the regular load, and will devote half of each day to classwork and the other half to work in one of the college offices. The scholarship will provide half of each student's total fees (tuition, room, board, student activity tickets, and all required fees) for this reduced program.

The Superior Student Committee at Stephens College is seeking ways by which the quality of instruction can be improved so that students of superior aptitudes can develop their full capacities to learn. A three-part pilot study involves sixty students.

Five students and a faculty member from the University of Bonn, Germany, concluded a spring term at Syracuse University with attendance at the campus leaders' conference where retiring and incoming student leaders exchanged ideas with each other and the administration. This group was

selected by the State Department as a pilot team of foreign students to study American collegiate activities. The groups observed the integration of campus activities and the curriculum and as a primary purpose participated in the student activities program, studying its relationship to academic life.

Four scholarships have been offered for students of Real Estate in Upsala College, first in the State of New Jersey to make the course a part of its regular curriculum.

Effective September, 1952, Upsala College will offer a complete program of professional education courses leading to certification for teaching in elementary schools.

A new graduate college is to be established at the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College.

Plans are being made for the centennial celebration of Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri. The program will start this fall and will conclude with commencement in June, 1953.

West Liberty State College has added religion to its curriculum.

Increases averaging ten per cent in salaries for faculty and other employees and a raise in tuition will be inaugurated at the Western Reserve University. Tuition rates will be increased from \$16 to \$20 per credit hour.

Western Reserve University will establish a division of visual arts incorporating the present University programs in architecture and art.

Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., has instituted a course in nursing education intended to train instructors, head nurses, and supervisors for hospitals and schools of nursing. It is open to both high school graduates and registered nurses.

Reports from Associations, Organizations, & Government Departments

"Adult Leadership" is a new magazine published by the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., an organization dedicated to the building of a dynamic adult education movement in this country. The Fund for Adult Education, an independent organization established by the Ford Foundation, has provided a generous grant to enable the magazine to be distributed at a reasonable cost.

Dr. Arthur S. Adams has announced that broad problems arising from the impact on colleges and universities of the rapidly expanding research programs sponsored by government agencies and by industry will be studied by the Committee on Institutional Research Policy of the American Council on Education. "The amount of research sponsored annually by the Federal Government in colleges and universities is increasing rapidly and may exceed \$150,000,000 this year. Industries are also offering a much greater volume of research than in the past."

A program to provide scholarship funds of \$1,000 each for the seventy-two accredited medical schools in the United States has been established by Charles Pfizer & Co., a Brooklyn chemical and pharmaceutical firm. The money will be given directly to the schools; the scholarship students are to be chosen by the deans of the medical schools from the first and second year classes on the basis of scholastic ability and financial need.

A grant of \$250,000 to Cornell University from the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation for a five-year program to train teachers for the elementary schools was announced. The program will offer advanced professional work of a seminar-internship type by which selected liberal-arts graduates will be prepared for careers in the elementary schools. Both men and women will be eligible for the course which will require one year and will lead to the degree of Master of Education. Fellowships are available for graduates of liberal-arts colleges who meet the requirements of the Graduate School. College graduates will begin their training as internees, working under the direction of carefully selected teachers in the public schools.

The Fund for Adult Education, established by the Ford Foundation, has granted \$145,000 for the Joint Committee on Educational Television, now in its second year of operation. The Committee will provide the necessary information to university and school administrators to help them to make informed decisions in regard to television. It will continue to encourage the expression of public and educational support for educational television through all possible channels.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation has announced the setting up of a program of fellowships for 400 public high school teachers during 1952-53. The purpose of the program is to give the recipient a chance to devote an academic year away from the classroom in activities that will extend his liberal education, improve his teaching ability, and increase his effectiveness as a member of his school system

and his community. The National Committee for High School Teacher Fellowships is inviting 400 public high school systems to participate in the program. The amount of a fellowship award will generally be equivalent to the salary the teacher would receive during the school year.

General Electric Company will offer more than \$370,000 in scholarships, fellowships, and grants during 1952-53 under an expanded educational assistance program.

Co-operation of three deans at Knox College, the University of Illinois, and the Illinois Institute of Technology was effective in causing the arrest of an alleged "fraternity row" confidence man.

Opportunity fellowships totaling \$100,000 were awarded to fifty members of minority groups by the John Hay Whitney Foundation. The Whitney awards are made each year to American citizens of exceptional promise, who, because of arbitrary barriers such as race, cultural background or region of residence, have not had the fullest opportunity to develop their abilities.

A grant of \$100,000 to encourage research on methods of identifying talent in youth and discovering future leaders has been announced by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation. The grant, made to the Social Science Research Council, is intended to stimulate research in developing new methods which will reveal emotional stability, drive, force, motivation, and other characteristics in the young not measured by the intelligence and aptitude tests currently in use.

Oliver J. Caldwell, noted author and educator, has been appointed Assistant Commissioner for International Education, Office of Education.

The first six awards to outstanding retired professors who will continue teaching and consultative responsibilities at selected small liberal arts colleges for the academic year, 1952-53, have been announced by the John Hay Whitney Foundation under its new program of Whitney Visiting Professors in the Humanities. At the same time the foundation made known a plan to establish a registry of professors in the humanities who, although retired, still wish to teach.

News Concerning Registrars and Admissions Officers

Ralph H. Geer, Director, Bureau of Appointments, Bowling Green State University, has been given additional duties as Director of Admissions.

"A Survey of Attendance Regulations in American Colleges," published in "School and Society," May 24, 1952, by Jeannette H. Eilenberg, Brooklyn College, reports a study based on 226 replies to a questionnaire involving attendance practices.

Mr. R. L. Katter has been named Registrar, Central Bible Institute and Seminary, Springfield, Missouri, succeeding Mr. T. I. Montgomery who is returning to the teaching profession.

William E. Scott, Associate Registrar and Assistant Dean of Students at the University of Chicago, was appointed Registrar effective July 1, 1952, succeeding Ernest C. Miller, who became Registrar Emeritus. He retains the post of Assistant Dean of Students. Nationally recognized as an authority on student relationships and the evaluation of college careers, Mr. Scott was on leave from the University from 1936 to 1941 as one of the directors of the eight-year study of the Progressive Education Association. He served as President of the Association of College Admission Counselors from 1947 to 1950 and as Chairman of the Commission on the Relations of Independent Schools to Higher Education in 1949. He is a co-author with Chamberlin, Chamberlin, and Drought of "Did you Succeed in College?"

Loren E. Edwards has been named Director of Admissions and Director of Alumni Relations, Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, New York, to succeed William T. Maeck who has accepted a post with the Rockefeller Foundation.

Assistant Directors Bernard P. Ireland, Charles P. Hurd, Hans W. Rosenhaupt, and Robert J. Senkier have been promoted to Associate Directors of University Admissions of Columbia University.

Ernest Whitworth, Associate Registrar and Director of Machine Records, Cornell University, has been appointed Director, Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences, American Council on Education, to succeed Charles W. McLane who has returned to the University of Missouri as Director of Admissions.

Reverend Hugh F. Smith, former Registrar, University of Detroit, is now Vice-President of Academic Affairs. He is succeeded by Joseph A. Perkowski, former Assistant Registrar.

Mr. William G. Rozeboom has assumed the responsibility as Registrar

of the University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa, succeeding F. W. Kracher.

Emory and Henry College, Emory, Virginia, announces the appointment of Nicholas C. Brown as Registrar and Dean of Men.

Robert A. Newcombe, former Director of Activities for Fiberglas Corp., has been named Director of Admissions at Juniata College.

William K. Selden, Director of Admissions, has been appointed to the new post of University Recorder at Northwestern University, and C. William Reiley, Associate Director, has succeeded Mr. Selden as Director of Admissions.

Dr. William A. Mabry has been appointed Director of Admissions at Randolph Macon Academy.

Mrs. Stephen K. Werlock has been appointed Registrar, New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, succeeding Esther W. Hawes.

John Muyskens, Jr., has been appointed to Director of Admissions, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York, to succeed J. Moreau Brown, III.

William S. Pettit, Assistant Registrar, has succeeded William J. Phillips, resigned, as Registrar at Ursinus College.

Samuel A. Nock, Book Review Editor of COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY, and formerly Registrar of Briarcliff Junior College, is now Registrar at Pace College, New York City.

Directory of Registrars and Admissions Officers in Member Institutions of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers*

ALABAMA

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College, Normal, R. A. Carter, Dean
Alabama College, The State College for Women, Montevallo, Virginia Hendrick,
Registrar
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Charles W. Edwards, Registrar
Alabama State College for Negroes, Montgomery, J. T. Brooks, Registrar
University of Alabama, University, William F. Adams, Dean of Admissions
Athens College, Athens, Edwin C. Price, Registrar
Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham, W. E. Glenn, Registrar
Howard College, Birmingham, Carl E. Todd, Registrar
Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Jean Rogers, Recorder
Judson College, Marion, Robert Bowling, Dean and Registrar
Miles College, Birmingham, Marjorie L. Hopkins, Registrar
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Mobile County, Louis J. Boudousquie, Registrar
State Teachers College, Florence, Chester M. Arehart, Registrar
State Teachers College, Jacksonville, The Registrar
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, T. C. Burnette, Registrar

ARIZONA

Arizona State College, Tempe, Alfred Thomas, Jr., Registrar and Director of
Admissions
University of Arizona, Tucson, C. Zaner Leshner, Registrar
Eastern Arizona Junior College, Thatcher, LaVon Evans, Registrar
Phoenix Junior College, Phoenix, J. Lee Thompson, Registrar

ARKANSAS

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Mrs. Charlie S. Hender-
son, Registrar
Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, Monticello, L. D. Griffin, Registrar
Arkansas Baptist College, Little Rock, Mrs. Ethel M. Beckley, Registrar
Arkansas College, Batesville, Roberta T. Dorr, Registrar
Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville, G. R. Turrentine, Registrar
Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Baird V. Keister, Registrar

* Editor's Note: Many institutions prefer to keep their memberships in a title,
such as "The Registrar," rather than in the name of an individual. Since this is a
Directory rather than an official membership list, the names of individuals have been
supplied so far as possible. Both the Editor and the Treasurer would welcome in-
formation about further corrections or changes.

Two or more names are listed for an institution only where a corresponding num-
ber of memberships is held.

Arkansas State Teachers College, Normal Station, Conway. G. Y. Short, Recorder
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Fred L. Kerr, Registrar; J. Bruce Kellar,
Assistant Registrar

The College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, H. W. Kloepper, Registrar
Dunbar Junior College, Little Rock, Mrs. Marguerite K. Alston, Registrar
Harding College, Searcy, W. K. Summit, Registrar
Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, C. B. Cooper, Registrar
John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Roger F. Cox, Registrar
Little Rock Junior College, Little Rock, Mrs. Jewell Reynolds, Registrar
Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, Frances Crawford, Registrar
Philander Smith College, Little Rock, The Registrar
Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, The Registrar
Southern State College, Magnolia, Matsye Gantt, Registrar

CALIFORNIA

Archdiocesan Junior Seminary, Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, Rev. Bernard J.
McCoy, C. M., Registrar

Armstrong College, Berkeley, J. Evan Armstrong, President
Bakersfield College, Bakersfield, Burns L. Finlinson, Dean of Records
The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, James H. Christian, Registrar
Cal-Aero Technical Institute, Glendale, J. D. Strickland, Registrar
California Baptist Theological Seminary, Seminary Knolls, Covina, Carl Henry
Koeker, Registrar

California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland, Merle A. Quait, Registrar
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, L. W. Jones, Registrar
California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, Leo F. Philbin, Registrar
University of California, Berkeley, H. A. Spindt, Director of Admissions
University of California, Davis, Howard B. Shontz, Registrar
University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, William C. Pomeroy, Registrar;
Edgar L. Lazier, Associate Director of Admissions
University of California, Santa Barbara College, Santa Barbara, Jerry H. Clark,
Registrar

Chapman College, Los Angeles, The Registrar
Chico State College, Chico, Wallin J. Carlson, Registrar
The Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Mrs. Urith S. Abbott, Registrar
Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Marion Jones, Registrar
Compton Junior College, Compton, Holland A. Spurgin, Dean of Records
Dominican College of San Rafael, San Rafael, Sister Mary Anita, Registrar
East Los Angeles Junior College, Los Angeles, Logan Hart, Dean of Admissions
and Records

Fresno State College, Fresno, Wilma F. Wight, Registrar
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Harold Lindsell, Dean
George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, George R. Hoff, Registrar
Glendale College, Glendale, C. E. McConnell, Registrar
Golden Gate College, San Francisco, Mrs. Mary M. Morgan, Registrar; Robert D.
Eddy, Dean of Admissions and Guidance

Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Jack W. Manning, Registrar
Hartnell College, Salinas, Jerry H. Girdner, Dean of Guidance and Registrar
College of the Holy Names, Oakland, Sister Mary Andrew, Registrar
Humboldt State College, Arcata
Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood, Mrs. Beatrice Holcomb, Registrar
John Muir College, Pasadena, John B. Weldon, Dean of Student Personnel

- La Sierra College, Arlington, Willeta Carlsen, Registrar
 LaVerne College, LaVerne, J. C. Brandt, Registrar
 Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, Los Angeles, Lawrence H. Starkey, Registrar
 Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Benjamin K. Swartz, Registrar
 Los Angeles Conservatory of Music and Arts, Los Angeles, K. R. Weidaw, Registrar
 Los Angeles Harbor Junior College, Wilmington, Hazel M. Whedon, Dean of Admissions and Guidance
 Los Angeles Pacific College, Los Angeles, The Registrar
 Los Angeles College of Optometry, Los Angeles, James F. English, Registrar-Comptroller
 Loyola University of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Catherina F. Emenaker, Registrar
 Marin Junior College, Kentfield, Marin County, Grace W. Donnan, Registrar
 College of Medical Evangelists, Los Angeles, Herbert A. Walls, Jr., Associate Registrar
 Menlo Junior College, Menlo Park, John D. Russell, Director of Admissions and Registrar
 Mills College, Mills College P. O., Mrs. Hilary Jones, Director of Admissions; Mary C. Walker, Recorder
 Mount Saint Mary's College, Los Angeles, Sister Mary Teresa
 Mt. San Antonio College (Junior), Pomona, Hazel A. Snoke, Registrar
 College of Notre Dame, Belmont, Sister Teresa Augustine, Dean-Registrar
 Occidental College, Los Angeles, Florence N. Brady, Registrar
 College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, Los Angeles, Benjamin W. Fullington, Director of Admissions and Registrar
 College of the Pacific, Stockton, Ellen L. Deering, Registrar
 Pacific Bible College of Azusa, Azusa, Malcolm R. Robertson, Registrar
 Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Kathryn Blade, Registrar
 Pacific Union College, Angwin, Edwin C. Walter, Registrar
 Palos Verdes College, Rolling Hills, Mrs. Eloise Eberle Klope, Registrar
 Pasadena College, Pasadena, Cecil W. Miller, Registrar
 Pasadena City College, Pasadena, R. W. Grinstead, Registrar
 College of Physicians and Surgeons, San Francisco, E. Frank Inskipp, Registrar
 Pomona College, Claremont, Edward Sanders, Dean of Students, Dean of Admissions; Margaret Maple, Registrar
 University of Redlands, Redlands, Mrs. Esther Mertins, Registrar; Warren Mild, Admissions Officer
 Riverside College, Riverside, Earl McDermont, Registrar
 Sacramento Junior College, Sacramento, M. J. Brickley, Registrar
 Sacramento State College, Sacramento
 St. John's Seminary, Camarillo, Rev. Oscar J. Miller, C. M., Registrar
 St. Mary's College of California, Saint Mary's College, Brother U. Cassian, Dean of the College
 San Diego Junior College, San Diego, A. W. Nall, Registrar and Director of Guidance
 San Diego State College, San Diego, Mrs. Marion L. Parker, Registrar
 San Francisco College for Women, Lone Mountain, San Francisco
 San Francisco Junior College, San Francisco, Mary Jane Learnard, Registrar
 San Francisco State College, San Francisco, Florence Vance, Registrar
 University of San Francisco, San Francisco, William J. Dillon, Registrar
 San Jose State College, San Jose, C. W. Quinley, Jr., Registrar
 San Mateo Junior College, San Mateo, Martha E. Burrill, Registrar

Santa Ana College, Santa Ana, Genevieve Humiston, Registrar
 University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, D. Arata, Registrar
 Santa Rosa Junior College, Santa Rosa, Louise B. Hallberg, Registrar
 Scripps College, Claremont, Mrs. Cecily A. Hall, Registrar
 College of the Sequoias, Visalia, The Registrar
 Southern California Bible College, Costa Mesa, Ward R. Williams, Acting Registrar
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, H. W. Patmore, Registrar; Herman J. Sheffield, Director of Admissions and Registration
 Southwestern University, Los Angeles, Lucile Pauls, Registrar
 Stanford University, Stanford, Harvey Hall, Registrar
 Stockton College, Stockton, L. L. Windmiller, Registrar
 Upland College, Upland, J. Eugene Haas, Registrar
 Ventura Junior College, Ventura, Robert W. Pax, Registrar
 Westmont College, Santa Barbara, Willard Harley, Acting Registrar
 Whittier College, Whittier, The Registrar
 Williams College, Berkeley, Irene C. Hopkins, Registrar

COLORADO

Adams State College, Alamosa, Mrs. Esther H. Lyman, Registrar
 Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Dean H. E. Mathias, Director of Admissions; Richard A. Elson, Registrar
 Colorado School of Mines, Golden, William V. Burger, Director of Admissions
 Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Fort Collins, Stella Morris, Registrar
 Colorado State College of Education, Greeley, R. M. Carson, Registrar
 Colorado Woman's College, Denver, George W. Gibbs, Registrar
 University of Colorado, Boulder, John Russell Little, Director of Admissions and Records
 University of Denver, Denver, Charles H. Maruth, Director of Admissions and Records; University Park Campus, Marjorie M. Cutler, Registrar
 Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College, Hesperus, C. W. McLain, Registrar
 La Junta Junior College, La Junta, Norma E. Powell, Registrar
 Loretto Heights College, Loretto, Sister Pauline Marie, Registrar
 Mesa County Junior College, Grand Junction, Mrs. Mattie F. Dorsey, Registrar
 Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo, Lulu L. Cuthbertson, Registrar
 Regis College, Denver, Rev. Louis G. Mattione, S. J., Dean and Director of Admissions; Rev. John J. Gibbons, S. J., Registrar
 Rockmont College, Denver, Casey Smith, Registrar
 Trinidad State Junior College, Trinidad, Guy C. Davis, Director of Student Personnel
 Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Herbert Dorricott, Registrar

CONNECTICUT

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Sister M. Dorilda, O. P., Registrar
 Anshurst College, South Woodstock, Sister St. Wilfrid, Registrar
 University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Donald W. Kern, Registrar
 Connecticut College for Women, New London, Mrs. Katherine Hunter Peugh, Registrar; M. Robert Cobbledick, Director of Admissions
 University of Connecticut, Storrs, Franklin O. Fingles, Registrar
 University of Connecticut, Waterbury Branch, Waterbury, Richard J. Dundas, Registrar
 Fairfield University, Fairfield, Robert F. Pitt, Registrar

- The Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Willard T. Carter, Dean of Administration
- Hillyer College, Hartford, Richard E. Smith, Registrar
- Julius Hartt School of Music, Hartford, Elizabeth Marner, Registrar
- Junior College of Commerce, New Haven, Mrs. Virginia Dailey, Registrar
- Larson Junior College, Hamden, The Registrar
- New Haven YMCA Junior College, New Haven, Julia M. Stockover, Registrar
- New Haven State Teachers College, New Haven, The Registrar
- Saint Joseph College, West Hartford, Sister M. Consilia, Registrar
- St. Mary's Seminary, Norwalk, Rev. Fr. James Sheridan, C. S. Sp., Registrar
- St. Thomas Seminary, Bloomfield, Rev. Francis A. Fries, Registrar
- Teachers College of Connecticut, New Britain, Walter Adamson, Director of Admissions and Registrar
- Trinity College, Hartford, Arthur H. Hughes, Dean
- Willimantic State Teachers College, Willimantic, M. Elizabeth Hood, Dean of Women and Acting Registrar
- Yale University, New Haven, Loomis Havemeyer, Associate Dean in charge of Undergraduate Registration; B. Hopkins Moses, Director of Central Records

DELAWARE

- University of Delaware, Newark, William H. Bohning, Registrar
- Faith Theological Seminary, Wilmington, Peter Stam, Jr., Dean and Registrar
- The King's College, King's College, Calvin H. Waldron, Acting Registrar
- Wesley Junior College, Dover

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- School of Advanced International Studies of the John Hopkins University, Washington, Elma L. Baker, Registrar
- American University, Washington, Hazel H. Feagans, University Registrar
- The Catholic University of America, Washington, Catherine R. Rich, Registrar
- Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, Washington, Sister M. Georgina, Registrar
- Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Washington, Theresa Birch Wilkins, Research Assistant
- Georgetown University, Washington, J. G. Connor, Registrar
- Georgetown Visitation Junior College, Washington, Sister Mary Veronica Aud, Registrar
- The George Washington University, Washington, Fred E. Nessell, Registrar
- U. S. Department of Agriculture, Graduate School, Washington, Louise Sullivan, Registrar
- Howard University, Washington, F. D. Wilkinson, Registrar
- Marjorie Webster Junior College, Washington, Julia L. McFarland, Registrar
- Miner Teachers College, Washington, John H. Williams, Registrar
- National University, Washington, Mrs. Alice K. Conner, Registrar
- Seventh Day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, Theodora Wirak, Registrar
- Southeastern University, Washington, The Registrar
- Trinity College, Washington, Sister Mary Mercedes, Registrar
- Washington Missionary College, Washington, Eunice J. Rozema, Registrar
- Wilson Teachers College, Washington, Paul O. Carr, Registrar

FLORIDA

- Barry College, Miami, Sister M. Trinita, O. P., Registrar
- Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, William M. DuBose, Registrar

Chipola Junior College, Marianna, G. W. Allen, Jr., Registrar
 The Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee, E. M. Thorpe, Registrar
 Florida Normal and Industrial Memorial College, St. Augustine, Frank T. Wilson, Jr., Registrar
 Florida State University, Tallahassee, Charles H. Walker, Registrar
 University of Florida, Gainesville, R. S. Johnson, Registrar
 Jacksonville College of Music, Jacksonville, L. Wolcott Prior, Registrar
 Jacksonville Junior College, Jacksonville, Benjamin L. Harton, Registrar
 John B. Stetson University, Deland, Barbara Rowe, Registrar
 University of Miami, Coral Gables, Ernest M. McCracken, Registrar; Harry H. Provin, Director of Admissions
 Rollins College, Winter Park, Dorothy I. Koehler, Registrar
 St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Charles O. Smout, Registrar
 University of Tampa, Tampa, Mrs. Sylvia Dean Harbert, Registrar

GEORGIA

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Evamae Howard, Registrar
 Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Laura M. Steele, Director of Admissions
 Albany State College, Albany, Aaron Brown, President; Carl S. Dabney, Registrar
 Armstrong College, Savannah, The Registrar
 Berry College, Mt. Berry, Edward C. Dickey, Registrar
 Bessie Tift College, Forsyth, Eugenia W. Stone, Registrar
 Brenau College, Gainesville, Ella DeWinfield, Registrar
 Clark College, Atlanta, A. A. McPheeters, Dean-Registrar
 Emory University, Emory University, I. W. Brock, Registrar
 Emory At Oxford, Oxford, M. C. Wiley, Registrar
 Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, H. A. Bowen, Registrar
 Georgia Military Academy, College Park, Major William R. Brewster, Jr., Dean
 Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, William L. Carmichael, Registrar
 Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, The Registrar
 Georgia Teachers College, Collegeboro, Viola Perry, Registrar
 University of Georgia, Athens, Walter N. Danner, Registrar
 University of Georgia, Atlanta Division, Atlanta, John D. Blair, Director of Admissions and Registrar (Acting)
 Mercer University, Macon, Frank G. Clark, Registrar
 Morehouse College, Atlanta, J. P. Whittaker, Registrar
 Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Anne E. Graves, Registrar
 Norman College, Norman Park, Claude W. Hicks, Dean-Registrar
 North Georgia College, Dahlonega, Will D. Young, Registrar
 Oglethorpe University, Oglethorpe University, The Registrar
 Paine College, Augusta, The Registrar
 Savannah State College, Savannah, B. Ingersoll, Registrar
 Shorter College, Rome
 Spelman College, Atlanta, Gladys E. Webber, Registrar
 Toccoa Falls Institute, Toccoa Falls, Mrs. Elizabeth M. Anderson, Registrar
 Valdosta State College, Valdosta, Mrs. Caroline Parrish Thomas, Registrar
 Wesleyan College, Macon, Elizabeth Winn, Registrar

IDAHO

Boise Junior College, Boise, Conan E. Mathews
 The College of Idaho, Caldwell, Bess Steunenberg, Registrar

Idaho State College, Pocatello, Anna B. Capellen, Registrar
 University of Idaho, Moscow, D. D. Du Sault, Registrar
 Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, Mallalieu A. Wilson, Registrar
 Ricks College, Rexburg, Eldred C. Stephenson, Registrar

ILLINOIS

Augustana College, Rock Island, Herbert L. Glynn, Director, Admissions and Records
 Aurora College, Aurora, James E. Crimi, Registrar
 Baptist Missionary Training School, Chicago, Suzanne G. Rinck, Registrar
 Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest, Registrar
 Belleville Township Junior College, Belleville, Edw. G. Hexter, Registrar
 Blackburn College, Carlinville, The Registrar
 Bradley University, Peoria, Asa Carter, Registrar
 Carthage College, Carthage, Pearl E. Goeller, Registrar
 Chicago Art Institute, Chicago, Lloyd H. Cowan, Registrar
 Chicago City Junior College, Herzl Branch, Chicago, Merlin J. Benrud, Registrar
 Chicago College of Optometry, Chicago, Hyman S. Wodis, O. D., Registrar
 Chicago College of Osteopathy, Chicago, Blanche Neumann, Registrar
 Chicago-Kent College of Law, Chicago, Clara A. Scheiner, Registrar
 Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Armin Geo. Weng, President
 The Chicago Medical School, Chicago, M. R. Geerdes, Registrar
 Chicago Musical College, Chicago, Harvey Ringel, Associate Dean
 Chicago Teachers College, Chicago, Mrs. Emma Fleer Muller, Registrar
 University of Chicago, Chicago, W. E. Scott, Registrar; Valerie C. Wickham, Director of Admissions
 Columbia College, Chicago, Daniel D. Howard, Dean
 Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, W. F. Kruse, Registrar
 DePaul University, Chicago, John C. McHugh, University Examiner; Alice E. McFarland, Registrar
 Eastern Illinois State College, Charleston
 Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Alfred Friedli, Registrar
 Eureka College, Eureka, T. E. Wiggins, Registrar
 Fournier Institute of Technology, Lemont, Rev. E. F. Hoffman, C. S. W., President
 Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Eleanor J. Tonkin, Registrar
 George Williams College, Chicago, G. L. Schuytema, Registrar and Examiner
 Greenville College, Greenville, Ruby Fickess, Registrar
 Illinois College, Jacksonville, Marcella Taylor, Registrar
 Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, John P. Makielski, Registrar
 Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Elsie Brenneman, Director of Admissions
 University of Illinois, Urbana, G. P. Tuttle, Director, Admissions and Records
 Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Mildred Hunt, Registrar
 The James Millikin University, Decatur, Byron L. Kerns, Registrar
 The John Marshall Law School, Chicago, Helen M. Thatcher, Registrar
 Joliet Junior College, Joliet, E. W. Rowley, Dean of the College
 Kendall College, Evanston, The Registrar
 Knox College, Galesburg, W. Lyle Willhite, Registrar
 Lake Forest University, Lake Forest, Marie J. Meloy, Registrar
 LaSalle-Peru-Oglesby College, LaSalle, Harry L. Wilmot, Dean and Registrar
 Lewis College of Science and Technology, Lockport, Clifford M. Boyer, Registrar
 Loyola University, Chicago, Elizabeth McCann, Registrar
 McKendree College, Lebanon, Ruth Walton, Registrar

MacMurray College for Women, Jacksonville, Mrs. Eloise Galloway, Recorder
 Maryknoll College, Glen Ellyn, Rev. Charles E. Kenney, M. M., Dean
 Monmouth College, Monmouth, Margaret C. Beste, Registrar
 Monticello College, Alton, The Registrar
 Morton Junior College, Cicero, Catherine Bowes, Registrar
 Mundelein College, Chicago, Sister Mary St. Helen, Registrar
 National College of Education, Evanston, Linford A. Marquart, Registrar
 North Central College, Naperville, C. C. Hower, Registrar
 North Park College, Chicago, Oscar E. Olson, Registrar
 Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, William M. Fouts, Registrar
 Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb, Edith L. Leifheit, Registrar;
 Eugenie Donnelly, Assistant Registrar and Director of Admissions
 Northwestern University, Evanston, Katherine George, Registrar
 Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Ralph E. Perry, Registrar
 Pestalozzi-Froebel Teachers College, Chicago, Daniel D. Howard, Dean of Students
 The Principia, Elmhurst, Mrs. Gretchen M. Happ, Registrar
 Quincy College, Quincy, Rev. Dunstan Velez, O. F. M., Registrar
 Rockford College, Rockford, Mary V. Braginton, Academic Dean
 Roosevelt College of Chicago, Donald H. Steward, Registrar; Howard G. Wine-
 brenner, Director of Admissions
 Rosary College, River Forest, Sister M. Fidelis, Registrar
 College of St. Francis, Joliet, Sister M. Mildred, Registrar
 St. Procopius College, Lisle, Rev. Daniel Kucera, O.S.B., Registrar
 St. Xavier College, Chicago, Sister Mary Charlotte, Registrar
 Sherwood Music School, Chicago, Arthur Wildman, Musical Director
 Shurtleff College, Alton, Mrs. Mary Alma Keirle, Registrar
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Marjorie Shank, Registrar
 Springfield Junior College, Springfield, Roman A. Hodalski, Registrar
 Thornton Township Junior College, Harvey, William E. McVey, Superintendent
 Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Hertha Voss, Registrar
 Wheaton College, Wheaton, Enock C. Dyrness, Registrar
 Woodrow Wilson Junior College, Chicago, J. Anthony Humphreys, Registrar
 Wright Junior College, Chicago, R. Clark Gilmore, Registrar

INDIANA

Anderson College, Anderson, Louise C. Johnson, Registrar
 Arthur Jordan Conservatory of Music, Indianapolis, Stanley Norris, Registrar
 Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Leo M. Hauptman, Registrar
 Butler University, Indianapolis, C. R. Maxam, Registrar
 Canterbury College, Danville, Mrs. Louzetta Jollief, Registrar
 DePauw University, Greencastle, Veneta Kunter, Registrar
 Earlham College, Richmond, Elizabeth K. Edwards, Registrar; Kent Morse, Director
 of Admissions
 Evansville College, Evansville, The Registrar
 Fort Wayne Bible College, Fort Wayne, Harvey L. Mitchell, Registrar
 Franklin College, Franklin, Virfel Roe, Registrar
 Goshen College, Goshen, Paul Bender, Registrar
 Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Herman A. Hoyt, Dean and Registrar
 Hanover College, Hanover, Robert Calvert, Jr., Registrar
 Huntington College, Huntington, Edna Shipley, Registrar
 Indiana Central College, Indianapolis, W. Earl Stoneburner, Registrar
 Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Harry E. Elder, Registrar

Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Mrs. I. M. Pontius, Registrar
 Indiana University, Bloomington, C. E. Harrell, Registrar
 John Herron Art School, Indianapolis, Mrs. Mary H. Finke, Acting Registrar
 Manchester College, North Manchester, Maxine R. Domer, Registrar
 Marian College, Indianapolis, Sister M. Rachel, Registrar
 Marion College, Marion, Doris I. Clevenger, Registrar
 University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Rev. Louis J. Thornton, Director of Admissions
 Purdue University, Lafayette, C. E. Dammon, Registrar
 Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, J. G. Lee, Registrar
 St. Francis College, Fort Wayne
 Saint Joseph's College, Collegeville, James R. Bogan, Registrar
 Saint Mary's College, Notre Dame, Sister M. Anastasia, Dean
 St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Sister Celeste, Registrar
 Taylor University, Upland, Grace Olson, Registrar
 Tri-State College, Angola, Vern Jones, Registrar
 Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, A. F. Scribner, Registrar
 Vincennes University, Vincennes, Medrith A. Jordan, Registrar
 Wabash College, Crawfordsville, The Registrar

IOWA

Briar Cliff College, Sioux City, Sister Mary DePazzi, Dean and Registrar
 Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, The Registrar
 Central College, Pella, Gladys E. Webber, Registrar
 Chicago Evangelistic Institute, University Park, Merne A. Harris, Registrar
 Clarke College, Dubuque, Sister Mary Francine Gould, B.V.M.
 Coe College, Cedar Rapids, John A. Fisher, Registrar
 Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, The Registrar; James M. McCawley, Director of Admissions
 Des Moines Still College of Osteopathy and Surgery, Des Moines, Wendell R. Fuller, Registrar
 Drake University, Des Moines, Roy W. Bixler, Registrar
 University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Wm. G. Rozeboom, Registrar; Harry Alan Turner, Director of Admissions
 Graceland College, Lamoni, J. C. Bergman, Registrar
 Grand View College, Des Moines, Mrs. A. C. Westerhof, Registrar of Counseling and Testing
 Grinnell College, Grinnell, Bethana McCandless, Registrar
 Iowa State College, Ames, Arthur M. Gowan, Registrar
 Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Marshall R. Beard, Registrar
 Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant, R. J. Hekel, Registrar
 Loras College, Dubuque, Rev. N. C. Barrett, Registrar
 Luther College, Decorah, O. W. Qualley, Dean and Registrar
 Marycrest College, Davenport, Sister Hazel Marie Roth, Dean
 Morningside College, Sioux City, Ira J. Gwinn, Registrar
 Mount Mercy Junior College, Cedar Rapids, Sister Mary Eleanor, Dean and Registrar
 Mt. St. Clare College and Academy, Clinton, Sister Mary Cortona Phelan, Registrar
 Northwestern Junior College, Orange City, H. V. E. Stegeman, Registrar
 Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Sister Marie Ancille, Dean
 St. Ambrose College, Davenport, The Registrar; Paul F. Roeder, Assistant Registrar
 Simpson College, Indianola, The Registrar
 The State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ted McCarrel, Registrar

Upper Iowa University, Fayette, The Registrar
 Waldorf College, Forest City, Rev. Sidney A. Rand, President
 Wartburg College, Waverly, Mattie Harms, Registrar
 Westmar College, LeMars, E. M. Miller, Registrar

KANSAS

Baker University, Baldwin, B. A. Gessner, Dean
 Bethany College, Lindsborg, Joe L. Hermanson, Dean-Registrar
 Bethel College, North Newton, Eldon W. Graber, Registrar
 Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Rufus R. Crozier, Registrar
 The College of Emporia, Emporia, Lyle W. Hilbert, Registrar
 Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays, Standlee V. Dalton, Registrar
 Friends Bible College, Haviland, O. Dean Worden, Vice President and Registrar
 Friends University, Wichita, Evelyn R. Clark, Registrar
 Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, Manhattan, Eric T. Tebow,
 Director of Admissions
 Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Nathan P. Budd, Registrar
 Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, J. J. Massey, Registrar
 University of Kansas, Lawrence, James K. Hitt, Registrar
 Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Thelma Book, Registrar
 McPherson College, McPherson, Mrs. Alice B. Martin, Registrar
 Manhattan Bible College, Manhattan, Virgil V. Hinds, Academic Dean
 Marymount College, Salina, Sister M. Madeleva, Registrar
 Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison, Sister Gonzaga Engelhart, Registrar
 Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, W. A. Fletcher, Registrar
 Ottawa University, Ottawa, Virginia Jennings, Registrar
 Sacred Heart College, Wichita, Sister M. Romana, Ad. P. P. S., Registrar
 St. John's College, Winfield, A. E. Kunzmann, Registrar
 St. Mary College, Xavier, Sister Rose Marie, Registrar
 Southwestern College, Winfield, William J. Poundstone, Registrar
 Sterling College, Sterling, Estelle Dougherty, Registrar
 Tabor College, Hillsboro, The Registrar
 Washburn Municipal University, Topeka, Gladys Phinney, Registrar

KENTUCKY

Ashland Junior College, Ashland, Goldie M. Wilson, Registrar
 Berea College, Berea, Adelaide Gundlach, Registrar
 Bowling Green Business University, Bowling Green, Nina Hammer, Registrar
 Brescia College, Owensboro, Sister M. Laurine Sheeran, Registrar
 Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, Roy O. Chumbler, Dean and Registrar
 The College of the Bible, Lexington, Charles Lynn Pyatt, Registrar
 Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Edward E. Sheils, Registrar
 Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College, Richmond, M. E. Mattox, Registrar
 Georgetown College, Georgetown, J. Foley Snyder, Registrar
 Kentucky State College, Frankfort, David H. Bradford, Dean and Registrar
 University of Kentucky, Lexington, R. L. Tuthill, Registrar
 Kentucky Wesleyan College, Winchester, The Registrar
 Lindsey Wilson Junior College, Columbia, A. M. Shelton, Dean-Registrar
 Loretto Junior College, Nerinx, Mother Mary Florence, Registrar
 University of Louisville, Louisville, John M. Houchens, Registrar
 Morehead State College, Morehead, Warren C. Lappin, Dean and Registrar
 Murray State Teachers College, Murray, Mrs. Cleo Gillis Hester, Registrar
 Nazareth College, Louisville, Sister Mary Paul Walsh, Registrar

Nazareth College and Academy, Nazareth, Sister Catherine Spalding, Registrar
 Paducah Junior College, Paducah, Richard Price, Chief Admissions Officer
 Pikeville College, Pikeville, Alice H. Record, Registrar
 St. Catharine Junior College, St. Catharine, Sister Agatha, Dean
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, A. R. Peterson, Registrar
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, School of Church Music, Louisville, Frances
 W. Winters, Secretary-Registrar
 Transylvania College, Lexington, Pearl Anderson, Registrar
 Union College, Barbourville, Mildred K. Moody, Registrar
 Ursuline College, Louisville, Sister Mary Patrice
 Villa Madonna College, Covington, Sister M. Irmina, O. S. B.
 Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green, E. H. Canon, Registrar

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, The Registrar
 Dillard University, New Orleans, Anna M. Sewall, Registrar
 Francis T. Nicholls Junior College of Louisiana State University, Thibodaux, James
 Lynn Powell, Registrar
 Louisiana College, Pineville, The Registrar
 Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston, Mabel May, Registrar
 Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Wilson B. Thiede, Registrar
 Louisiana State University, School of Medicine, Department of Nursing Education,
 New Orleans, Leah E. Bertel, Assistant to the Director
 Loyola University, New Orleans, Carmel Discon, Registrar
 McNeese State College, Lake Charles, Inez S. Moses, Registrar
 New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, James C. Taylor, Registrar
 Northeast Junior College, Louisiana State University, Monroe, Buel S. Hamner,
 Registrar
 Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, The Registrar
 St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, Sister M. Philip, O. P., Registrar
 Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, C. J. Hyde, Registrar
 Southern University and A. & M. College, Southern Branch P.O., Baton Rouge,
 J. J. Hedgemon, Registrar
 Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, J. S. Bonnet, Registrar
 The Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, Mrs. Florence M. Tappino,
 Registrar
 Ursuline College, New Orleans, Mother Mary Loyola Ott, O. S. U., Registrar
 Xavier University, New Orleans, Sister M. Emmanuella, Registrar

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston, Mabel L. Libby, Registrar
 Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Helen B. Johnson, Registrar; Hubert S. Shaw, Di-
 rector of Admissions
 Colby College, Waterville, George T. Nickerson, Dean of Men; Frances Perkins,
 Recorder
 University of Maine, Orono, J. A. Gannett, Registrar; Percy F. Crane, Director of
 Admissions
 Nason College, Springvale, C. James Colville, Jr., Director of Admissions and
 Public Relations
 Portland Junior College, Portland, Harold M. Lawrence, Registrar
 Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Elizabeth G. Kimball, Dean of the College

MARYLAND

Baltimore Junior College, Baltimore, Chester H. Katenkamp, Dean
 The University of Baltimore, Baltimore, P. Lewis Kaye, Dean of the Junior College and Director of Admissions
 Goucher College, Baltimore, Mildred Covey, Registrar; Mary Ross Flowers, Director of Admissions
 Hood College, Frederick, Grace N. Brown, Registrar
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Irene M. Davis, Registrar; William Logan, Director of Admissions
 Loyola College, Baltimore, The Dean
 Maryland State College, Division of University of Maryland at Princess Anne, Princess Anne, Violet J. Wood, Director of Admissions
 Maryland State Teachers College, Towson, Rebecca C. Tansil, Director of Admissions; Eleanor Tibbetts, Registrar
 University of Maryland, College Park, Alma H. Preinkert, Registrar
 Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Harriett C. Preble, Registrar
 Morgan College, Baltimore, Edward N. Wilson, Registrar
 Mt. Saint Agnes College, Baltimore, Sister M. Carlotta, R.S.N., Registrar
 Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, John M. Roddy, Jr., Registrar
 Ner Israel Rabbinical College, Baltimore, Herman N. Neuberger, Registrar
 Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore, Sister Mary Elissa, Registrar
 Peabody Conservatory of Music, Baltimore, Virginia Carty, Dean
 St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Sister Elizabeth, Registrar
 St. Mary's Seminary Junior College, St. Mary's City, Louise K. Rotha
 State Teachers College, Salisbury, Robert Gebhardtshauer, Registrar
 United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Richard E. Heise, Registrar
 Washington College, Chestertown, Ermon N. Foster, Registrar
 Western Maryland College, Westminster, Martha E. Manahan, Registrar
 Woodstock College, Woodstock, Charles J. Galloway, S.J., Registrar

MASSACHUSETTS

American International College, Springfield, Esther D. Frary, Registrar
 Amherst College, Amherst, Eugene S. Wilson, Associate Dean; Gladys A. Kimball, Recorder
 Assumption College, Worcester, Rev. Louis Dion, Dean and Registrar
 Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, Dorothy E. Bartlett, Registrar
 Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Paul C. Staake, Jr., Registrar; Gordon M. Trim, Director of Admissions
 Becker Junior College, Worcester, Gilbert H. Reed, Director of Admissions
 Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Francis J. Campbell, Registrar; Frederick A. Norton, Registrar
 Boston College, College of Arts and Sciences Intown, Boston, The Registrar
 Boston School of Occupational Therapy, Boston, Acile Harrison, Registrar
 Boston University, Boston, Donald L. Oliver, Director of Admissions
 Boston University, College of Liberal Arts, Boston, Katherine E. Hilliker, Assistant to the Dean; Earle F. Wilder, Registrar
 Boston University, College of Business Administration, Boston, Robert L. Peel, Registrar
 Boston University, College of Practical Arts and Letters, Boston, Carla Paaske, Registrar
 Bradford Junior College, Bradford, Frederick C. Ferry, Jr., Dean
 Brandeis University, Waltham, C. Ruggles Smith, Registrar

Clark University, Worcester, Lydia P. Colby, Registrar
 Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston, Madeline N. Nease, Registrar
 Emerson College, Boston, The Registrar
 Emmanuel College, Boston, Sister Mary St. Edward, Registrar
 Endicott Junior College, Beverly, Dean Eleanor Tupper, Registrar
 The Garland School, Boston, Ann M. Sullivan, Registrar
 Gordon College of Theology and Missions, Boston, The Registrar
 Harvard College, Cambridge, The Registrar
 College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Raymond D. Kennedy, Registrar; Rev. Leo A. Shea, S.J., Director of Admissions
 College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee, Sister Helen Joseph, Registrar
 Lesley College, Cambridge, Mrs. Margery W. Bouma, Registrar and Director of Admissions
 Lowell Textile Institute, Lowell, Ruth Foote, Registrar
 Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, G. Barbara Lindstrom, Registrar and Financial Secretary
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, J. C. MacKinnon, Registrar
 University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Marshall O. Lanphear, Registrar
 Merrimack College, Andover, Rev. Francis X. Smith, O.S.A., Registrar
 Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Genevieve F. Pratt, Registrar
 Northeastern University, Boston, Rudolph M. Morris, Registrar; Milton J. Schlagenhauf, Director of Admissions
 Nursery Training School of Boston, Boston, Katherine J. Jones, Executive Secretary and Registrar
 Pine Manor Junior College, Wellesley, Carolyn Churchill, Registrar
 Regis College, Weston, Sister Mary Mildred, Registrar
 St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Rev. John D. Callahan, Registrar
 Simmons College, Boston, Margaret Gonyea, Registrar
 Smith College, Northampton, Mrs. Gladys D. Diggs, Registrar
 Springfield College, Springfield, Mrs. Olga Eaton Ellis, Registrar; R. William Cheney, Director of Admissions
 Staley College, Brookline, Emily E. Staley, Registrar; Charles A. Brennan, Assistant Registrar
 State Teachers College, Framingham, John F. Bowler, Registrar
 Suffolk University, Boston, Donald W. Goodrich, Registrar
 Wellesley College, Wellesley, Kathleen Elliott, Recorder
 Western New England College, Springfield, Elmer H. Allen, Dean of Students and Director of Admissions
 Wheaton College, Norton
 Wheelock College, Boston, Laura A. Townsend, Registrar
 Williams College, Williamstown, Mrs. Nelson S. McCraw, Registrar and Editor
 Worcester Junior College, Worcester, Phoebe E. Wyman, Registrar
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Gertrude R. Ruggs, Registrar

MICHIGAN

Adrian College, Adrian, The Registrar
 Albion College, Albion, Marvin F. Pahl, Registrar
 Alma College, Alma, Molly Parrish, Registrar; Guile J. Graham, Director of Admissions
 Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Sister M. Blandina, Registrar
 Bay City Junior College, Bay City, W. E. Thorsberg, Registrar
 Calvin College, Grand Rapids, H. C. Dekker, Registrar

Central Michigan College of Education, Mount Pleasant, David M. Trout, Registrar
 Cleary College, Ypsilanti, Walter Greig, Registrar
 Dearborn Junior College, Dearborn, Fred K. Eshleman, Dean
 Detroit College of Law, Detroit, Charles H. King, Dean
 Detroit Institute of Musical Art, Detroit, William H. Rees, Registrar
 Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit, J. S. Young, Registrar
 University of Detroit, Detroit, Rev. Hugh F. Smith, S.J., Registrar
 Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mrs. Wanda Westcott MacMorland, Director of Admissions
 Ferris Institute, Big Rapids, Ralph E. Pattullo, Registrar
 Flint Junior College, Flint, Muriel Parsell, Registrar
 Gogebic Junior College, Ironwood, Jacob Solin, Director
 Grand Rapids Junior College, Grand Rapids, Ruth Richason, Registrar
 The Highland Park Junior College, Highland Park, Grant O. Withey, Dean
 Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Florence Kreiter, Registrar
 Hope College, Holland, Paul E. Hinkamp, Registrar
 Jackson Junior College, Jackson, Barbara H. Fausell, Registrar
 Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Registrar and Director of Student Personnel
 Lawrence Institute of Technology, Highland Park, Genevieve Dooley, Registrar
 Marygrove College, Detroit, Sister Miriam Fidelis
 Mercy College, Detroit, Sister Mary Leona, R.S.M.
 Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Mrs. Maybelle Stevens, Registrar
 Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, L. G. Duggan, Registrar
 Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Sault Ste. Marie, H. Crawford, Registrar
 Michigan State College, East Lansing, Robert S. Linton, Registrar
 Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Everett L. Marshall, Registrar
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Ira M. Smith, Registrar; Clyde Vroman, Director of Admissions
 Nazareth College, Nazareth, Sister Marie Arthur, Registrar
 Northern Michigan College of Education, Marquette, L. O. Gant, Registrar
 Olivet College, Olivet, Helen M. Mitchell, Registrar
 Owosso Bible College, Owosso, Charles R. Randolph, Registrar
 Port Huron Junior College, Port Huron, John H. McKenzie, Registrar
 St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake, The Registrar
 Siena Heights College, Adrian, Sister M. Bertha, Registrar
 Wayne University, Detroit, H. H. Pixley, Director of Admissions, Records and Registration
 Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo, John C. Hoekje, Registrar; Leonard Gernant, Assistant Registrar

MINNESOTA

Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Mildred Joel, Registrar
 Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, N. S. Holte, Registrar
 Bethel College, St. Paul, C. E. Carlson, Dean
 Carleton College, Northfield, Kenneth W. Wegner, Registrar
 Concordia College, Moorhead, Carl R. Narveson, Registrar
 Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Oliver C. Hagglund, Registrar
 Hamline University, St. Paul, Claribelle B. Olson, Registrar; Arthur S. Williamson, Director of Admissions
 Macalester College, St. Paul, Raymond Jay Bradley, Registrar
 Mankato State Teachers College, Mankato, W. A. Cox, Registrar

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, True E. Pettengill, Office of Registrar
 University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch, Duluth, The Registrar
 Northwestern Schools, Minneapolis, William P. Gowler, Acting Registrar
 Rochester Junior College, Rochester, Hazel H. Creal, Registrar
 College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Sister Paula Reiten, O.S.B., Registrar
 College of St. Catherine, Saint Paul, Sister Helen Margaret, Registrar
 St. John's University, Collegeville, Rev. Arno Gustin, O.S.B., Registrar
 Saint Mary's College, Winona, Brother J. Leo, Registrar
 St. Olaf College, Northfield, Inez Frayseth, Registrar; C. R. Swanson, Director of Admissions
 The Saint Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Rev. George J. Zishovsky, Registrar
 College of Saint Scholastica, Duluth, Sister M. Mercedes Ryan, Registrar
 College of Saint Teresa, Winona, Sister Mary Gretchen Berg, Registrar
 College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Rev. Donald J. Gormley, Registrar
 State Teachers College, Bemidji
 State Teachers College, Moorhead, Earl Foremann, Director, Admissions, Records and Evaluation
 State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Mary Lilleskov, Registrar
 Winona State Teachers College, Winona, Helen B. Pritchard, Registrar
 Worthington Junior College, Worthington, W. Donald Olsen, Dean

MISSISSIPPI

Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College, Alcorn, Marie M. Garner, Registrar
 Belhaven College, Jackson, The Registrar
 Hinds Junior College, Raymond, Mildred L. Herrin, Registrar
 Jackson College, Jackson, De Lars Funches, Registrar
 Millsaps College, Jackson, E. S. Wallace, Registrar
 Mississippi College, Clinton, Addie Mae Stevens, Registrar
 Mississippi Delta State Teachers College, Cleveland, Katie Mauldin, Registrar
 Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg, O. N. Darby, Registrar
 Mississippi State College, State College, Theodore K. Martin, Registrar
 Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, G. T. Buckley, Registrar
 University of Mississippi, University, Robert B. Ellis, Registrar
 Mississippi Woman's College, Hattiesburg, Evelyn Ewell, Registrar

MISSOURI

Central Bible Institute and Seminary, Springfield, R. L. Katter, Registrar
 Central College, Fayette, Martha C. Ricketts, Registrar
 Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Mrs. Thelma Bryant, Registrar
 Christian College, Columbia, Mrs. Harriet Williams, Registrar
 Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, L. C. Wuerffel, Dean
 Cotter Junior College for Young Women, Nevada, Orpha Stockard, Registrar
 Culver-Stockton College, Canton, The Registrar
 Drury College, Springfield, Mrs. Gertrude Rockwell, Registrar
 Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Sister John Marie, Registrar
 Hannibal-LaGrange College, Hannibal, Howard S. Higdon, Dean and Registrar
 Joplin Junior College, Joplin, Margaret Mitchell, Registrar
 Junior College, Kansas City, R. A. Ball, Director of Admissions
 Kansas City College of Osteopathy and Surgery, Kansas City, J. M. Peach, Dean and Admissions Officer
 University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Caleb G. Shipley, Director of Admissions
 Kemper Military School, Boonville, Dean F. J. Marston

Lincoln University, Jefferson City, The Registrar
 Lindenwood College, St. Charles, The Registrar
 Maryville College, St. Louis, Mother Lucille J. Pezolt, r.s.c.j., Registrar
 University of Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Rolla, Noel Hubbard, Registrar
 University of Missouri, Columbia, S. Woodson Canada, Registrar; Charles W. McLane, Director of Admissions
 Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Stanley R. Hayden, Registrar
 Monett Junior College, Monett, Wilma Dunaway, Registrar
 National College for Christian Workers, Kansas City, Frieda M. Gipson, Registrar
 Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville, Orville Bowers, Registrar
 Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville, R. P. Foster, Registrar
 Notre Dame Junior College, St. Louis, Sister M. Renelle, S.S.N.D., Registrar
 Park College, Parkville, H. L. Williams, Registrar
 Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Rev. Joseph E. Gough, Dean and Admissions Officer
 St. Joseph Junior College, St. Joseph, Nelle Blum, Dean
 St. Louis Institute of Music, St. Louis, Mrs. Velma T. Honig, Registrar
 St. Louis Preparatory Seminary, St. Louis, J. J. Edwards, C. M., Dean of Studies and Registrar
 St. Louis Roman Catholic Theological (Kenrick) Seminary, St. Louis, Marion L. Gibbons, Registrar
 St. Louis University, St. Louis, Paul T. McDonald, Registrar
 St. Louis University School of Law, St. Louis, Robert Vining, Registrar
 St. Paul's College, Concordia, Allen Nauss, Dean of Students
 St. Teresa's Senior College, Kansas City, Sister Ann Regis, Registrar
 Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, E. F. Vaeth, Registrar
 Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, The Registrar
 Southwest Missouri State Teachers College, Springfield, Guy H. Thompson, Registrar
 Stephens College, Columbia, P. R. M. Armstrong, Registrar; J. Scott Hemry, Director of Admissions
 Tarkio College, Tarkio, Fred L. Keller, Registrar
 Washington University, St. Louis, O. W. Wagner, Director of Student Records; William Glasgow Bowling, Dean of Admissions
 Washington University, School of Medicine, St. Louis, W. B. Parker, Registrar
 Webster College, Webster Groves, Sister Alexander Marie, Registrar
 Wentworth Military Academy, Lexington, Dallas C. Buck, Dean
 Westminster College, Fulton, Donald B. Gordon, Registrar
 William Jewell College, Liberty, E. W. Holzapfel, Dean of Students; F. M. Derwacter, Registrar
 William Woods College, Fulton, Dean W. A. Brandenburg, Registrar

MONTANA

Carroll College, Helena, William Ogle, Registrar
 Custer County Junior College, Miles City, D. B. Campbell, Dean and Registrar
 Eastern Montana College of Education, Billings, Lincoln J. Aikins, Registrar
 College of Great Falls, Great Falls, Sister Helen Paula, Registrar
 Montana School of Mines, Butte, W. M. Brown, Registrar
 Montana State College, Bozeman, Martha L. Hawksworth, Registrar
 State University of Montana, Missoula, Leo Smith, Registrar
 Northern Montana College, Havre
 Western Montana College of Education, Dillon, Dorothy Gelhaus, Registrar

NEBRASKA

Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Willa Koenig, Registrar
Creighton University, Omaha, Jack N. Williams, Registrar
Dana College, Blair, F. H. Larson, Registrar
Doane College, Crete, Loyd C. Oleson, Registrar
Duchesne College, Omaha, Mother Catherine McShane, Registrar
Fairbury Junior College, Fairbury, Dean L. F. Sinkey, Registrar
Grace Bible Institute, Omaha, Paul Kuhlman, Dean
Hastings College, Hastings, Eunice Chapman, Registrar
Midland College, Fremont, Mildred A. Cattern, Registrar
Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha, Alice Smith, Registrar
Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron
Nebraska State Teachers College, Wayne, The Registrar
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, G. W. Rosenlof, Registrar
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Mrs. Helen Luschei, Registrar
State Teachers College, Peru, L. B. Mathews, Registrar
Union College, Lincoln, Marie Anderson, Registrar
York College, York, Aaron Bergen, Registrar

NEVADA

University of Nevada, Reno, Clarence E. Byrd, Registrar and Director of Admissions

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Colby Junior College, New London, Elizabeth Sladen, Registrar
Dartmouth College, Hanover, Robert O. Conant, Registrar
Mount St. Mary College, Hooksett, Mrs. Mary Patricia Thirsk, Registrar
University of New Hampshire, Durham, Doris Beane, University Recorder
Rivier College, Nashua, Sister Marie Carmella, Dean

NEW JERSEY

Bayonne Junior College, Bayonne, Harvey J. Yogman, Registrar
Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield, Edward M. Carter, Dean
Caldwell College for Women, Caldwell, Sister M. Marguerite, O.P., Registrar
Centenary Junior College, Hackettstown, Edward W. Seay, President; Margaret E. Hight, Dean; Mrs. Mabel W. Kelley, Director of Admissions
Drew University, Madison, F. Taylor Jones, Registrar
Fairleigh Dickinson College, Rutherford, Sylvia Sammartino, Registrar
Georgian Court College, Lakewood, Sister Mary Incarnata, Registrar
Jersey City Junior College, Jersey City, Frances L. Wilson, Registrar; Catherine L. Hughes, Assistant Registrar
The Junior College of Bergen County, Teaneck, C. L. Littel, Registrar
Monmouth Junior College, Long Branch, Ruth E. Nebel, Registrar
Newark College of Engineering, Newark, Frank A. Grammer, Dean of Students and Director of Admissions; E. Alice Hickey, Registrar
New Jersey State Teachers College, Jersey City, F. A. Irwin, President
New Jersey State Teachers College, Montclair, The Registrar
New Jersey State Teachers College, Newark, Vera F. Minkin, Registrar
New Jersey State Teachers College at Paterson, Paterson, Joan Fischer, Registrar
Panzer College of Physical Education and Hygiene, East Orange, Hazel M. Wacker, Registrar
Princeton University, Princeton, Howard W. Stepp, Registrar

Rider College, Trenton, J. Goodner Gill, Vice-President
 Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, George A. Kramer, University Director of Admissions; L. H. Martin, Registrar
 Newark Colleges of Rutgers University, Newark, Hugh F. Bennett, Jr., Registrar; Agnes D. Watt, Director of Admissions
 New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, Mrs. Verna M. Werlock, Registrar; Edna M. Newby, Director of Admission Office
 The College of South Jersey, Rutgers University, Camden, Heinz Schwaneger, Registrar
 College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, Sister Rose Therese, Registrar
 St. Peter's College, Jersey City, Kenneth J. Dwyer, Registrar
 The St. Peter's College, School of Business Administration, Jersey City, Vincent P. McInerney, Registrar
 Seton Hall College, South Orange, Miss M. K. Fitzsimmons, Registrar
 Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. H. Memory, Registrar
 Trenton Junior College, Trenton, Janet S. Trembath, Registrar
 Union Junior College, Cranford, Dorothea Wiersma, Registrar
 Upsala College, East Orange, G. P. Carlson, Secretary-Registrar
 Westminster Choir College, Princeton, Rhea B. Williamson, Dean of the College

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, Ruth Wheeler, Registrar
 New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, State College, Era Renfrow, Registrar
 New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, C. H. Robinson, Registrar
 New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, Arthur P. Stanton, Registrar
 New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, Office of the Registrar
 New Mexico Western College, Silver City, Donald S. Overturf, Registrar; Mrs. Ruth M. Humphrey, Assistant Registrar
 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, Office of Registrar
 College of St. Joseph on-the-Rio-Grande, Albuquerque, Sister M. Rayneria Willison, Registrar

NEW YORK

Academy of Aeronautics, La Guardia Airport, Walter M. Hartung, Director of Training, Vice President
 Adelphi College, Garden City, Rosemary A. Feeney, Registrar
 Alfred University, Alfred, Clifford M. Potter, Registrar; William J. O'Conner, Admissions
 Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, Elsie L. Quinn, Registrar; Richard M. Gummere, Jr., Director of Admissions
 Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, The Registrar
 The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, Emma E. Deters, Registrar
 Cazenovia Junior College, Cazenovia, Clarence A. Heagle, Registrar
 Champlain College of Associated Colleges of Upper New York, Plattsburg, Ralph G. Rishel, Director of Admissions; Marguerite A. Van Bree, Registrar
 Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, F. A. Ramsdell, Registrar
 Colgate University, Hamilton, William F. Griffith, Associate Dean; William J. Everts, Registrar
 Columbia University, New York, John M. Mullins, Registrar; Charles P. Hurd, Assistant Director of University Admissions; Frederick E. Croxton, Interim Director of University Admissions

- Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, Margaret Giddings, Registrar
 Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, Frank H. Hagemeyer, Registrar;
 . Hattie Jarmon, Officer in Charge of Admissions
 Concordia Collegiate Institute, Bronxville, The Dean
 The Cooper Union, New York, Miss Bateman, Registrar
 Cornell University, Ithaca, Eugene F. Bradford, Registrar; Herbert H. Williams,
 Director of Admissions; David A. Warren, Assistant Registrar
 D'Youville College, Buffalo, Sister Alice of the Sacred Heart
 Elmira College, Elmira, The Registrar
 Finch Junior College, New York, Mrs. Doris Broiles Post
 Fordham University, City Hall Division, New York, E. Vincent O'Brien, Registrar
 Fordham University, College of Arts and Sciences, New York, Rev. Eugene K.
 Culhane, S.J., Assistant Dean and Director of Admissions
 Good Counsel College, White Plains, Sister M. Ambrose, Registrar
 Hamilton College, Clinton, Mrs. Maleska Robinson, Registrar
 Hartwick College, Oneonta, Fanny Aurill Bishop, Registrar
 Hobart College, Geneva, John S. Witte, Director of Admissions; Elizabeth R.
 Durfee, Registrar
 Hofstra College, Hempstead, Charles J. Meixel, Registrar
 Houghton College, Houghton, The Registrar
 Hunter College of the City of New York, New York, Mrs. Mary B. J. Lehn,
 Registrar; Dorothy B. Hall, Assistant Registrar
 Iona College, New Rochelle, John J. Elins, Registrar
 Ithaca College, Ithaca, Florence Howland, Registrar
 Juilliard School of Music, New York, Judson Ehrbar, Registrar
 Keuka College, Keuka Park, Helen M. Space, Registrar
 Ladycliff College, Highland Falls, Sister Miriam, Registrar
 Le Moyne College, Syracuse, Theodore G. Meyers, Registrar
 Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute, Farmingdale, H. B. Knapp,
 Director; Wilson P. Merritt, Assistant Director and Registrar
 Long Island University, Brooklyn, Eleanor Roth, Registrar
 Manhattan College, New York, Brother Alban, F.S.C., Registrar; John A. Cossa,
 Director, General Guidance Division
 Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, New York, Gertrude V. Brady,
 Registrar
 Marymount College, Tarrytown-on-Hudson, M. De Lourdes, Registrar
 Mills School, New York, Margaret M. Devine, Associate Director
 The Missionary Training Institute, Nyack, Harold W. Boon, Dean and Registrar
 Mount St. Joseph Teachers College, Buffalo, Sister M. Theodosia, Registrar
 College of Mount St. Vincent, New York, Sister Miriam Rose, Registrar
 Nazareth College, Rochester, Sister Marie Anne, Registrar
 College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, Mother M. Paula Bero, O.S.U., Registrar
 The New School for Social Research, New York, Mary Lynn, Registrar, Graduate
 Division; Charles Godley, Registrar, Adult Education Division
 College of the City of New York, New York, Robert L. Taylor, Registrar
 The City College (School of Business), New York, Agnes Clare Mulligan, Assistant
 Registrar
 New York School of Social Work, New York, Dorothy Evans, Registrar
 New York State College of Forestry, Syracuse, Raymond F. Crossman, Registrar
 New York State College for Teachers, Albany, The Registrar
 New York University, New York, Elwood C. Kastner, Registrar
 Niagara University, Niagara University, Charles J. Edgette, Dean

- Notre Dame College of Staten Island, Staten Island, Sister St. Mary Caroline, Registrar
- Pace College, New York, S. A. Nock, Registrar; Joseph S. Treu, Recorder; Charles P. LaMorte, Assistant Director of Admissions
- Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, Mrs. Eileen North, Registrar
- The Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, George S. Eaton, Registrar
- Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, Holman J. Swinney, Registrar and Director of Admissions
- Queens College, Flushing, Howard A. Knag, Registrar
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, John A. Dunlop, Registrar
- Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chile, Ruth McIntyre, Registrar
- Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, Alfred A. Johns, Registrar
- University of Rochester, Rochester, Olive M. Schrader, Registrar; Charles R. Dalton, Director of Admissions and Director of Student Aid
- University of Rochester, School of Liberal and Applied Studies, Rochester, Ruth M. Harper, Secretary-Registrar
- University of Rochester, College for Women, Rochester, Constance H. Wood, Registrar
- Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester, Rochester, Arthur H. Larson, Secretary-Registrar
- Russell Sage College, Troy, Eva Margaret Pearson, Director of Admissions
- St. Bernardine of Siena College, Loudonville, Albany County, Rev. Aurelius A. Fell, O.F.M., Registrar
- St. Bonaventure College, St. Bonaventure, Rev. Kevin Fox, O.F.M., Registrar
- St. Francis College, Brooklyn, Mrs. Nell M. Rothschild, Registrar
- St. John's University, Brooklyn, Frederick E. Kienle, Registrar
- St. John's University, Graduate School, Brooklyn, Marion F. Muchow, Registrar
- St. John's University, Teachers College, Brooklyn, Ruth M. Himmelsbach, Registrar
- St. John's University, College of Pharmacy, Brooklyn, Agnes G. Tighe, Registrar
- St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn, Sister Veneranda, Registrar
- St. Lawrence University, Canton, Helen Whalen, Registrar; J. Moreau Brown, Director of Admissions
- College of St. Rose, Albany, Sister Therese, Registrar
- Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, Alice M. Bovard, Director of Admissions
- Shelton College, New York, G. Douglas Young, Registrar
- Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, Anna Ludington Hobbs, Registrar
- State Teachers College, Brockport, Ella M. Orts, Registrar
- State Teachers College, Buffalo, The Registrar
- State Teachers College, Fredonia, Alva M. Keen, Registrar
- State Teachers College, New Paltz, The Registrar
- State Teachers College, Oneonta, Ruth C. Hendee, Registrar
- State Teachers College, Potsdam, Dorothy A. Hall, Registrar
- State University Teachers College, Oswego, Mrs. Mary D. Hennessey, Registrar
- State University of New York, Medical Center at New York City, Brooklyn, The Registrar
- State University of New York, Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, Buffalo, Laurence E. Spring, Assistant Director of Extension and Registrar
- State University of New York, Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, White Plains, Robert H. Reynolds, Registrar
- State University of New York, Harpur College, Endicott, Walter J. Mehl, Dean of Students; Aysel Searles, Jr., Admissions Counselor
- Syracuse University, Syracuse, K. J. Kennedy, Registrar

Union College, Schenectady, Mrs. Charlotte M. Rapelje, Registrar
 United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, L.I., Lt. Raymond W. Kana, USMS, Registrar
 United States Military Academy, West Point, Robert T. Timbers, Registrar
 Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, Julia G. Bacon, Recorder
 Wagner Memorial Lutheran College, Staten Island, Herbert R. Childs, Registrar
 Wells College, Aurora, Barbara Alden, Recorder
 Yeshiva University, Yeshiva College of Liberal Arts and Science, New York, Morris Silverman, Registrar; Jacob I. Hartstein, Dean, Graduate Division

NORTH CAROLINA

The Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro, C. R. A. Cunningham, Registrar
 Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, Perry Case, Registrar
 Bennett College for Women, Greensboro, Willa B. Player, Registrar
 Brevard College, Brevard, Mrs. Mary B. Livengood, Registrar
 Catawba College, Salisbury, Reid Jann, Acting Registrar
 Charlotte College, Charlotte, Lucille A. Puette, Registrar
 Davidson College, Davidson, Fred W. Hengeveld, Registrar
 Duke University, Durham, E. B. Weatherspoon, Director of Admissions
 Duke University Divinity School, Durham, Helen M. Kendall, Recorder
 East Carolina Teachers College, Greenville, J. K. Long, Registrar
 Elon College, Elon College, A. L. Hook, Registrar
 Flora Macdonald College, Red Springs, Hazel Morrison, Dean of Faculty and Registrar
 Greensboro College, Greensboro, Letha Brock, Registrar
 High Point College, High Point, N. P. Yarborough, Registrar
 Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, J. Arthur Twitty, Registrar
 Lees-McRae College, Banner Elk, Paul H. McEwen, Dean and Registrar
 Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, Edwin L. Setzler, Registrar
 Livingston College, Salisbury, Julia B. Duncan, Registrar
 Louisburg College, Louisburg, Mrs. Collins Gretter, Registrar
 Meredith College, Raleigh, Mrs. Vera Tart Marsh, Registrar
 Mitchell College, Statesville, The Registrar
 North Carolina College of Agriculture and Engineering, Raleigh, W. L. Mayer, Director of Registration
 North Carolina College at Durham, Durham, Frances M. Eagleson, Registrar
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Roy Armstrong, Director of Admissions
 The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro, Mildred Newton, Director of Admissions
 Peace College, Raleigh, Frances Golden, Registrar
 Pembroke State College, Pembroke, James A. Jacobs, Registrar
 Pineland College, Salemburg, Don R. Womble, Registrar
 Queens College, Charlotte, Mrs. Carolyn Good, Registrar
 Salem College, Winston-Salem, Margaret L. Simpson, Registrar
 Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, Grady S. Patterson, Registrar
 Wilmington College, Wilmington, Mrs. C. D. Gurganus, Registrar
 Winston-Salem Teachers College, Winston-Salem, Frances R. Coble, Registrar

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown, William Westley, Registrar
 Minot State Teachers College, Minot, O. L. Alm, Registrar

North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, The Registrar
 North Dakota State School of Science, Wahpeton, W. M. Nordgaard, Registrar
 University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, Ruby M. McKenzie, Registrar
 State Teachers College, Dickinson, John J. Coffelt, Registrar
 State Teachers College, Mayville, J. Evert Scholten, Registrar
 State Teachers College, Valley City, Adolph Soroos, Registrar

OHIO

University of Akron, Akron, Richard H. Schmidt, Registrar
 Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Miriam L. Dickinson, Registrar; Mrs. Fressa
 Baker Inman, Director of Admissions
 Ashland College, Ashland, Martha E. Holmes, Recorder
 Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Jess J. Petty, Registrar
 Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Glenn Van Wormer, Registrar
 Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ray S. Hilty, Registrar
 Capital University, Columbus, Frances Quinlin, Registrar
 Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, W. E. Nudd, Registrar
 Central State College, Wilberforce, Gladys L. Powell, Registrar
 Cincinnati College of Pharmacy, Cincinnati, Arthur R. Weitkamp, Registrar
 University of Cincinnati, Campus Section, Cincinnati, Helen H. Burgoyne, Registrar
 Cleveland Bible College, Cleveland, Ora D. Lovell, Dean-Registrar
 University of Dayton, Dayton, Joseph Mervar, Registrar
 Denison University, Granville, Donald R. Fitch, Registrar; Charlotte F. Weeks,
 Secretary of the Admissions Committee
 Fenn College, Cleveland, Wm. A. Patterson, Registrar
 Findlay College, Findlay, Myrtle Deming, Registrar
 Franklin University, Columbus, Joseph F. Frasch, Director
 Heidelberg College, Tiffin, E. R. Butcher, Director of Admissions; C. Lucile Christ-
 man, Registrar
 Hiram College, Hiram, Lawrence C. Underwood, Registrar
 John Carroll University, Cleveland, Eugene Mittinger, Registrar
 Kent State University, Kent, Charles E. Atkinson, Registrar
 Kenyon College, Gambier, S. R. McGowan, Registrar; W. Tracy Scudder, Director
 of Admissions
 Lake Erie College, Painesville, Muriel Poland, Registrar
 Marietta College, Marietta, Mrs. Lillian Spindler Sinclair, Registrar
 Mary Manse College, Toledo, Sister M. Ethelreda, Registrar
 Miami University, Oxford, Wm. C. Smyser, Registrar; Harry M. Gerlach, Director
 of Admissions
 College of Mount St. Joseph-On-The-Ohio, Mount St. Joseph, Sister Reginald,
 Registrar
 Mount Union College, Alliance, Robert W. Tripp, Registrar
 College of Music of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Marjora W. Shank, Registrar & Dean
 of Women
 Muskingum College, New Concord, Carrie E. McKnight, Registrar
 Notre Dame College, South Euclid, Sister Mary Aquinas, Registrar
 Oberlin College, Oberlin, Edith Stanley, Registrar
 Ohio Mechanics Institute, Cincinnati, Hazel S. Selby, Registrar
 Ohio Northern University, Ada, J. A. Woofter, Registrar
 The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ronald B. Thompson, Registrar & Examiner
 Ohio University, Athens, F. B. Dilley, Director of Admissions; Robert E. Mahn,
 Registrar

Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Allen C. Conger, Registrar
 Otterbein College, Westerville, Floyd J. Vance, Registrar
 Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati, Sister Mary Martina, R.S.M., Registrar
 St. John College, Cleveland, Rose Mary Bland, Registrar
 College of St. Mary of the Springs, Columbus, Sister Marie Rosaire, O.P., Registrar
 Salmon P. Chase College of the YMCA, Cincinnati, Eleanor Webster, Registrar
 Sinclair College, Dayton, C. C. Bussey, Director
 The College of Steubenville, Steubenville, Rev. Philip A. Clarke, T.O.R., Academic
 Dean-Registrar
 The Teachers College, Athenaeum of Ohio, Cincinnati, Rev. Carl J. Ryan, Dean
 University of Toledo, Toledo, Mrs. Alina Markowski, Registrar
 Ursuline College, Cleveland, Sister Grace, Registrar
 Western College, Oxford, Margaret L. Ebeling, Registrar
 Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Edward T. Downer, Registrar
 Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, F. A. McGinnis, Registrar
 Wilmington College, Wilmington, Sarah F. Castle, Registrar
 Wittenberg College, Springfield, The Registrar
 College of Wooster, Wooster, Arthur F. Southwick, Registrar
 Xavier University, Cincinnati, Raymond Fellingner, Registrar
 Youngstown College, Youngstown, P. P. Buchanan, Registrar

OKLAHOMA

Bethany-Peniel College, Bethany, C. H. Wiman, Registrar
 Catholic College of Oklahoma, Guthrie, The Registrar
 Central State College, Edmond, A. G. Hitchcock, Registrar
 Conners State Agricultural College, Warner, Anna B. Catlin, Registrar
 East Central State Teachers College, Ada, W. Harvey Faust, Registrar
 Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Wilburton, Minnie Antonelli,
 Registrar
 Langston University, Langston, C. D. Batchlor, Registrar
 Northeastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Miami, Mrs. J. C. Hutts, Registrar
 Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Noble Bryan, Registrar
 Northern Oklahoma Junior College, Tonkawa, The Registrar
 Northwestern State College, Alva, Aurice Huguley, Registrar
 Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Herbert Patterson,
 Dean of Administration
 Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, L. E. Solomon, Registrar
 Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, L. A. Jones, Registrar
 Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha, Sam Evans, Registrar
 Oklahoma Military Academy, Claremore, Fred J. McKenna, Major, ONG, Dean
 University of Oklahoma, Norman, J. E. Fellows, Registrar and Dean of Admis-
 sions
 Panhandle Agricultural & Mechanical College, Goodwell, E. Lee Nichols, Jr.,
 Registrar
 Phillips University, Enid, M. H. Ziegler, Registrar
 Southeastern State College, Durant, Sam O. Pool, Registrar
 Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Millie A. Thomas, Registrar
 Spartan College of Aeronautical Engineering, Tulsa, W. D. Trulock, Dean
 University of Tulsa, Tulsa, George V. Metzel, Registrar

OREGON

Cascade College, Portland, Philip S. Clapp, Dean-Registrar

Eastern Oregon College of Education, LaGrande, Lyle H. Johnson, Registrar
 George Fox College, Newberg, Mary C. Sutton, Registrar
 Lewis & Clark College, Portland, William H. Norris, Registrar
 Linfield College, McMinnville, E. A. Whitman, Registrar
 Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Sister Mary Agnetta, Registrar
 Mount Angel Seminary, St. Benedict, Rev. Anselm Galvin, Registrar
 Multnomah College, Portland, The Registrar
 Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, R. E. Lieuallen, Registrar
 Oregon State College, Corvallis, D. T. Ordeman, Registrar
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Clifford L. Constance, Registrar
 University of Oregon Dental School, Portland, The Registrar
 Pacific University, Forest Grove, Leo S. Arnoldi, Registrar and Director of Admissions
 University of Portland, Portland, Wayne Durrell, Registrar
 Reed College, Portland, Margaret A. Scott, Registrar
 Southern Oregon College of Education, Ashland, Mabel W. Winston, Registrar
 Willamette University, Salem, H. B. Jory, Registrar

PENNSYLVANIA

Albright College, Reading, Anna R. Benninger, Registrar
 Allegheny College, Meadville, The Registrar; Harvey Herring, Director of Admissions
 Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, John A. Jadus, Registrar
 Beaver College, Jenkintown, Mrs. Ruth S. Lindemann, Registrar; Marjorie Darling, Director of Admissions
 Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Mrs. Marion C. Anderson, Recorder
 Bucknell University, Lewisburg, George Faint, Registrar
 Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, E. K. Collins, Registrar; J. M. Daniels, Chairman of Admissions
 Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Elizabeth Mae Curtis, Registrar
 Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia, Sister M. Clare Joseph, Registrar
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, A. W. Climenhaga, Registrar; Benjamin D. James, Director of Admissions, Dean of Freshmen
 Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Mrs. Helen J. Tavenner
 Dropsie College for Hebrew & Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, Sarai Zausmer, Registrar
 Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Maurice J. Murphy, Registrar; Rev. S. J. Federici, C.S.Sp., Director of Admissions
 The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Joseph R. Bowman, Registrar
 Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Henry G. Bucher, Dean
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Yvonne E. Gibbel, Recorder
 Gannon College, Erie, Rev. Robert Levis, Registrar
 Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Mrs. Lucille D. Henery, Registrar
 Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Charles R. Wolfe, Registrar
 Grove City College, Grove City, Harold O. White, Registrar
 The Hahnemann Medical College & Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Joseph S. Hepburn, Registrar
 Hershey Junior College, Hershey, V. H. Fenstermacher, Dean
 Immaculata College, Immaculata, Sister Anastasia Maria, Registrar
 The Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, George A. Bennett, Dean

- Juniata College, Huntingdon, A. William Engel, Jr., Registrar
Keystone Junior College, LaPlume, The Registrar
King's College, Wilkes-Barre, The Registrar
LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Brother G. Joseph, Registrar
Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Gladys Fencil, Registrar
Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, The Registrar; Wray H. Congdon, Dean
Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Paul Kuehner, Registrar
Lycoming College, Williamsport, G. H. Gramley, Director of Admissions
Marywood College, Scranton, Sister M. Margrete, Registrar
Mercyhurst College, Erie, Sister Mary Alice Weber, Registrar
Messiah College, Grantham, The Dean
College Misericordia, Dallas, Sister Mary Rosaire, Registrar
Moravian College & Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Samuel R. Kilpatrick, Registrar
Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Mrs. Josephine C. Curtis, Registrar
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh, Sister M. Regis, Dean
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, The Registrar
Penn Hall Junior College, Chambersburg
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Jane Schmann, Registrar
Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Clarence R. Moll, Dean of Admissions & Student Personnel
Pennsylvania State College, State College, C. O. Williams, Dean of Admissions & Registrar
Pennsylvania State College of Optometry, Philadelphia, Lawrence Fitch, Dean
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Gene D. Gisburne, Dean of Admissions
Philadelphia Bible Institute, Philadelphia, Rev. Clair M. Hitz, Registrar
Philadelphia College of Osteopathy, Philadelphia, Thomas N. Rowland, Jr., Registrar
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, Philadelphia, John E. Kramer, Registrar
Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia, Donald B. Partridge, Director of Admissions and Placement
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, J. G. Quick, Registrar
The Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Evelyn Fulton, Registrar
Rosemont College, Rosemont, Mother Mary St. Stephen, Registrar
St. Francis College, Loretta, Rev. F. P. Flanagan, T.O.R., Registrar
Saint Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Michael P. Boland, Registrar
St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Jude L. Coughlin, Registrar
University of Scranton, Scranton, Frank J. O'Hara, Registrar
Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Sister Rose Irene Boggs, Registrar
State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Joseph F. Noonan, President
State Teachers College, Indiana, Mary L. Esch, Registrar
State Teachers College, Lock Haven, C. M. Sullivan, Dean of Instruction
State Teachers College, Shippensburg,
State Teachers College, West Chester, P. Paul Ross, Registrar
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Mrs. Isabel N. Cox, Registrar
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, John M. Moore, Registrar
Temple University, Philadelphia, John M. Rhoads, Registrar
Theological Seminary of the Evangelical & Reformed Church, Lancaster, Oswin S. Frantz, Registrar
Thiel College, Greenville, H. G. Gebert, Registrar; Alton G. Kloss, Director of Admissions and Placement

Ursinus College, Collegeville, William S. Pettit, Registrar; Geoffrey Dolman, Assistant Registrar
 Villa Maria College, Erie, The Registrar
 Villanova College, Villanova, Rev. John J. Curran, O.S.A., Registrar
 Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Ralph H. Thomas, Dean of the College; Frederick Frank, Secretary of Admissions
 Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, M. K. Talpas, Registrar
 Westminster College, New Wilmington, Isabel Ramsey, Recorder
 Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Herbert J. Morris, Registrar
 Wilson College, Chambersburg, Emma L. Benignus, Registrar
 York Junior College, York, Byron Hartley, Dean and Registrar

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence, Emery R. Walker, Dean of Admissions; Milton E. Noble, Recorder
 Bryant College, Providence, E. Gardner Jacobs, Vice President; Elmer C. Wilbur, Dean
 Pembroke College, Brown University, Providence, Dorothy S. Horton, Recorder
 Providence Bible Institute, Providence, George H. Cramer, Registrar
 Providence College, Providence, Daniel M. Galliher, Registrar
 Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, George L. Bradley, Registrar
 Rhode Island State College, Kingston, John C. Weldin, Registrar; James W. Eastwood, Director of Admissions
 Salve Regina College, Newport, Sister Mary Martina, R.S.M.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Allen University, Columbia, R. L. Pegues, Registrar
 Anderson College, Anderson, Juanita Davis, Registrar
 Bob Jones University, Greenville, Theodore Mercer, Registrar
 The Citadel, Charleston, Leonard A. Prouty, Registrar
 Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, G. E. Metz, Registrar; K. N. Vickery, Director of Admissions, Assistant Registrar
 Columbia Bible College, Columbia, Kathryn L. Warren, Registrar
 Columbia College, Columbia, Mrs. Ruth H. Lightsey, Registrar
 Converse College, Spartanburg, Louisa Trawick, Registrar
 Erskine College, Due West, Robert C. Brownlee, Business Manager & Registrar
 Furman University, Greenville, C. L. Razor, Registrar
 Furman University, Woman's College, Greenville, Eula Barton, Registrar
 Lander College, Greenwood, The Registrar
 Limestone College, Gaffney, Miriam A. Thompson, Registrar
 Morris College, Sumter, C. R. Mitchell, Registrar
 Newberry College, Newberry, James C. Abrams, Registrar
 Presbyterian College, Clinton, Mrs. Nellie G. Campbell, Registrar
 University of South Carolina, Columbia, H. O. Strohecker, Registrar
 S. C. State A. & M. College, Orangeburg, J. D. McGhee, Registrar
 Wesleyan Methodist College, Central, E. Harold Shigley, Dean of Administration & Registrar
 Winthrop College, Rock Hill, John G. Kelly, Registrar
 Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. F. Logan, Registrar

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls, I. B. Hauge, Registrar

Black Hills Teachers College, Spearfish, J. B. Smith, Registrar
 Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, J. J. Knox, Registrar
 General Beadles State Teachers College, Madison, R. A. Williams, Registrar
 Huron College, Huron, Noble C. Gantvoort, Registrar
 Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, Registrar's Office
 Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, J. Hervey Shutts, Dean
 South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City, Robert H. Moore, Registrar
 South Dakota State College, Brookings, D. B. Doner, Registrar
 University of South Dakota, Vermillion, H. W. Frankenfield, Registrar
 Southern State Teachers College, Springfield, M. E. Burgi, Registrar
 Yankton College, Yankton, Adolph Schock, Registrar

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, M. P. Bowman, Dean & Registrar
 Belmont College, Nashville, Office of the Registrar
 Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Mrs. Nina M. Rubin, Registrar
 University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Reuben W. Holland, Registrar
 Christian Brothers College, Memphis, Brother Thomas, FSC, Dean
 David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Ralph R. Bryant, Acting Registrar
 East Tennessee State College, Johnson City, William M. Beasley, Registrar
 Fisk University, Nashville, Harold F. Smith, Registrar
 Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, E. Claude Gardner, Registrar
 George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Wm. H. Vaughan, Registrar
 King College, Bristol, The Registrar
 Knoxville College, Knoxville, The Registrar
 Lambuth College, Jackson, Helen Womack, Registrar
 Lane College, Jackson, George L. Thacker, Registrar
 Lee College, Cleveland, Lacy D. Powell, Registrar and Dean of Students
 Le Moyne College, Memphis, Margaret Bush, Registrar
 Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Hugh T. Ramsey, Registrar
 Madison College, Madison College, Floyd Byers, Registrar
 Martin College, Pulaski, The Registrar
 Maryville College, Maryville, Viola M. Lightfoot, Assistant to the Dean of Students
 Meharry Medical College, Nashville, J. R. Smothers, Jr., Registrar
 Memphis State College, Memphis, R. P. Clark, Registrar
 Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro, W. B. Judd, Registrar
 Milligan College, Milligan College, Lois Hale, Registrar
 Morristown Normal and Industrial College, Morristown, Paul A. Edwards, Registrar
 Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, The Registrar
 Siena College, Memphis, Sister M. Jamesetta, Registrar
 The University of the South, Sewanee, Mrs. R. G. Dudley, Registrar
 Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, E. B. Vaughn, Registrar
 Southern Missionary College, Collegedale, Registrar
 Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis, Malcolm Evans, Registrar
 Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State College, Nashville, Earl L. Sasser, Registrar
 Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, Austin W. Smith, Registrar
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville, R. F. Thomason, Dean of Admissions and Records
 University of Tennessee Junior College, Martin, Myrtle H. Phillips, Registrar
 Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens, C. O. Douglass, Registrar

Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, Amy L. Person, Registrar
 Tusculum College, Greeneville, Edith Knipp, Registrar
 Union University, Jackson, The Registrar
 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, James L. Buford, Registrar
 William Jennings Bryan University, Dayton, Judson Rudd, President

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Kenneth Rasco, Registrar
 Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, H. L. Heaton, Registrar
 Amarillo College, Amarillo, Marion M. Porter, Registrar
 Arlington State College, Arlington, Weldon Brewster, Acting Registrar
 Austin College, Sherman, Perrin C. Smith, Registrar
 Baylor University, Waco, Truett K. Grant, Registrar
 Butler College, Tyler, Mrs. M. B. Hunter, Registrar
 Daniel Baker College, Brownwood, William W. Stevic, Jr., Registrar
 East Texas Baptist College, Marshall, S. E. Smith, Registrar
 East Texas State Teachers College, Commerce, John S. Windell, Registrar
 Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Alton B. Lee, Registrar
 The University of Houston, Houston, Ramon A. Vitulli, Registrar
 Howard Payne College, Brownwood, The Registrar
 Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, Sister M. Antoninus, Registrar
 Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, Mrs. V. Carney-Waddleton, Registrar
 Lamar College, Beaumont, Celeste Kitchen, Registrar
 McMurray College, Abilene, Jerome Vannoy, Registrar
 Mary Allen College, Crockett, Mrs. E. V. Holmes, Registrar
 Mary Harden-Baylor College, Belton, Zelma Lee Bond, Registrar
 Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Mrs. J. H. Jameson, Registrar
 North Texas State College, Denton, Alex Dickie, Registrar
 Odessa College, Odessa, Jack Rodgers, Dean-Registrar
 Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Sister Mary Pia, Registrar
 Paris Junior College, Paris, Jo Ann James, Registrar
 Prairie View State College, Prairie View, T. R. Solomon, Registrar
 The Rice Institute, Houston, S. G. McCann, Registrar
 St. Edward's University, Austin, The Registrar
 St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio, Rev. Thomas J. Treadaway, Registrar
 University of St. Thomas, Houston, Rev. John W. Meyer, C. S. B., Registrar
 Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville, J. Cullen Sowers, Registrar
 Samuel Huston College, Austin, J. L. McNealy, Dean-Registrar
 San Angelo College, San Angelo, Burl M. Abel, Dean-Registrar
 South Texas College, Houston, Iola Barron, Registrar
 Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Leonard G. Nystrom, Registrar
 Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Katie Reed, Registrar
 Southwestern Junior College, Keene, Paul L. Wilson, Registrar
 Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, J. Lloyd Read, Registrar
 Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas, Dallas, Anne Rucker, Registrar
 Southwestern University, Georgetown, Pearl A. Neas, Registrar
 Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College, Nacogdoches, The Registrar
 Sul Ross State College, Alpine, Anna D. Linn, Registrar
 Tarleton State College, Stephenville, J. E. Tompkins, Jr., Registrar

Temple Junior College, Temple, H. M. Dawson, Associate Dean and Registrar
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, S. W. Hutton, Registrar
Texas College, Tyler, Mrs. Eugene B. Long, Registrar
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville, George McCulley, Registrar
Texas Lutheran College, Sequin, Arthur G. Gustafson, Registrar
Texas State College for Women, Denton, Francis W. Emerson, Registrar
The Texas State University for Negroes, Houston, William H. Bell, Registrar and
Director of Admissions
Texas Technological College, Lubbock, W. B. Clement, Registrar
University of Texas, Austin, Captain H. Y. McCown, Registrar
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth, Harry W. Rice, Registrar
Texas Western College, El Paso
Trinity University, San Antonio, Clifford H. Perea, Registrar
Victoria Junior College, Victoria, The Registrar
Wayland Baptist College, Plainview, Evelyn Burgess, Registrar
West Texas State College, Canyon, Frank H. Morgan, Registrar
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Mrs. Merle DeBona, Registrar
Wiley College, Marshall, The Registrar
Ivy Rhodes Van Dyck, University Park, Dallas

UTAH

Branch Agricultural College, Cedar City, J. H. Plummer, Registrar
Brigham Young University, Provo, John E. Hayes, Registrar
Dixie Junior College, St. George, Mathew M. Bentley, Registrar
College of St. Mary-of-the-Wasatch, Salt Lake City, Sister M. Bethania, Registrar
Snow College, Ephraim, Lee R. Thompson, Registrar
Utah Agricultural College, Logan, W. H. Bell, Registrar
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, J. A. Norton, Registrar
Weber College, Ogden, Clarisse H. Hall, Registrar
Westminster College, Salt Lake City, J. S. Boughton, Dean

VERMONT

Middlebury College, Middlebury, Marion E. Holmes, Registrar
Norwich University, Northfield, The Registrar
St. Michael's College, Winooski Park, Thomas A. Garrett, Registrar
Trinity College, Burlington, The Registrar
University of Vermont, Burlington, Francis N. Hamblin, Registrar; Harold C. Collins, Director of Admissions

VIRGINIA

Averett College, Danville, The Dean and Registrar
Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, John W. Boitnott, Dean
Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, John R. Mumaw, Acting President
Emory and Henry College, Emory, Dorothy L. Schrader, Registrar
Hampton Institute, Hampton, William M. Cooper, Registrar
Hollins College, Hollins College, Mrs. Margaret Eldridge, Registrar
Institute of Textile Technology, Charlottesville, May A. Colver, Registrar
Longwood College, Farmville, Virgilia I. Bugg, Registrar
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Blanche Latham, Registrar
Madison College, Harrisonburg, Helen M. Frank, Registrar
Marion College, Marion, Catherine Bell, Registrar

Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Marquerite Hillhouse, Registrar
 Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Louis C. Guenther, Registrar
 Radford College, Radford, R. J. Young, Registrar
 Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Elizabeth R. Stearns, Assistant Registrar
 Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg
 Richmond College, University of Richmond, Richmond, Helen A. Monsell, Registrar
 Westhampton College of University of Richmond, Richmond, Catherine Bell, Registrar
 Roanoke College, Salem, D. R. Carpenter, Registrar
 St. Paul's Polytechnic Institute, Lawrenceville, T. H. E. Jones, Registrar
 Shenandoah College and Shenandoah Conservatory of Music, Dayton, C. H. Connor, Registrar
 Southern Seminary and Junior College, Buena Vista, Mrs. H. Russell Robey, Director
 Stratford College, Danville, Marguerite Carter, Registrar
 Sullins College, Bristol, Raymond A. Bailey, Registrar
 Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Jeannette Boone, Recorder
 Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Colonel William Couper, Registrar
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blackburg, Clarice Slusher, Registrar
 Virginia State College, Petersburg, J. Louise Barrett, Registrar
 Virginia State College, Norfolk Division, Norfolk, Joseph W. Brown, Registrar
 Virginia Union University, Richmond, Theresita N. Braxton, Registrar
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville, George O. Ferguson, Jr., Registrar; Richard R. Fletcher, Associate Director of Admissions
 Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Charles L. Green, Registrar
 College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, J. Wilfred Lambert, Registrar
 College of William and Mary, Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Norfolk, Norfolk, Ida Long Rogers, Registrar

WASHINGTON

Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Perry Mitchell, Registrar
 Centralia Junior College, Centralia, Arthur W. Ehret, Registrar
 Clark College, Vancouver, M. J. Greenshields, Registrar-Bursar
 Eastern Washington College of Education, Cheney, George W. Wallace, Registrar
 Everett Junior College, Everett, Gertrude T. Van Arkel, Registrar
 Gonzaga University, Spokane, M. R. Chapman, Registrar
 Holy Names College, Spokane, Sister M. Francis Xavier, President
 Lower Columbia Junior College, Longview, Mrs. Alton B. Clark, Registrar
 Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Philip E. Hauge, Dean and Registrar
 College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Raymond L. Powell, Registrar
 St. Martin's College, Olympia, Meinrad J. Gaul, O.S.B., Dean of Instruction & Registrar
 Seattle University, Seattle, Mrs. Kenneth S. Johnson, Registrar
 Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Virginia B. Smith, Registrar
 Simpson Bible Institute, Seattle, Beverly Younglowe, Registrar
 The State College of Washington, Pullman, Harry M. Chambers, Registrar
 Walla Walla College, College Place, Mrs. Irene Black, Registrar
 University of Washington, Seattle, Mrs. Ethelyn Toner, Registrar
 Wenatchee Junior College, Wenatchee, Mrs. Dorothea E. Clay, Registrar-Bursar
 Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Donald A. Ferris, Registrar
 Whitman College, Walla Walla, Douglas V. McClane, Director of Admissions & Registrar
 Whitworth College, Spokane, Estalla E. Baldwin, Registrar

WEST VIRGINIA

Alderson-Broadus College, Philippi, Earl Vinie, Dean of the Faculty
 Beckley College, Beckley, The Dean and Registrar
 Bethany College, Bethany, Elizabeth Belt, Registrar
 Concord College, Athens, S. L. McGraw, Registrar
 Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, Fred A. Miller, Registrar
 Fairmont State College, Fairmont, George R. Hunt, Registrar
 Glenville State College, Glenville, Michael E. Posey, Registrar
 Greenbrier College, Lewisburg, J. Ralph Murray, President
 Marshall College, Huntington, Luther E. Bledsoe, Registrar
 Mason College of Music and Fine Arts, Charleston, Grace Martin Taylor, Registrar
 Potomac State School of West Virginia University, Keyser, K. S. McKee, Dean & Registrar
 Salem College, Salem, Alta L. Van Horn, Registrar
 Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, The Registrar
 Storer College, Harper's Ferry, Mrs. Violet J. Darius, Registrar
 West Liberty State College, West Liberty, Jesse J. Pugh, Registrar
 West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery, The Registrar
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, J. Everett Long, Registrar & Chairman of Admissions
 West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, A. A. Schoolcraft, Dean and Registrar

WISCONSIN

Alverno College, Milwaukee, Sister M. Edmund, O.S.F., Registrar
 Beloit College, Beloit, Bessie M. Weirick, Registrar
 The Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee, Sister Mary Magdeleine, O.S.F., Registrar
 Carroll College, Waukesha, Royanna Benjamin, Registrar
 Central State Teachers College, Stevens Point
 Dominican College, Racine, Sister M. Theodore, O. P., Registrar
 Eau Claire State Teachers College, Eau Claire, Leonard C. Hass, Dean of Registration
 Edgewood College, Madison, Sister Mary Joan, Registrar
 Holy Family College, Manitowoc, Sister Mary Dominic, Registrar
 Layton School of Art, Milwaukee, Ted B. Fitzwater, Registrar
 Lawrence College, Appleton, Dorothy H. Draheim, Registrar
 Marian College, Fond du Lac, Sister M. Gertrudis, C.S.A., Registrar
 Marquette University, Milwaukee, George E. Vander Beke, Registrar
 Milton College, Milton, J. L. Skaggs, Registrar
 Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Ruth Dainkoehler, Registrar
 Milwaukee School of Engineering, Milwaukee, Mrs. George J. Swart, Registrar;
 Glenn Christians, Coordinator of Admissions
 Mission House College, Plymouth, The Registrar
 Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Sister Mary Ignatia, S.S.N.D., Registrar
 Northland College, Ashland, Jno. T. Kendrigan, Registrar
 The Institute of Paper Chemistry, Appleton, Harry F. Lewis, Dean; J. Edward Todd, Assistant Dean
 Ripon College, Ripon, The Registrar
 Saint Francis Major Seminary, Milwaukee, Rev. Francis J. Bisenius, Registrar
 St. Norbert College, West DePere, Rev. F. F. Dupont, Registrar
 State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Lurlyn Williams, Registrar
 Stout Institute, Menomonie, Gertrude M. O'Brien, Registrar

Wisconsin State College at Platteville, Platteville, Milton Longhorn, Registrar
 Wisconsin State College, River Falls, E. J. Prucha, Registrar
 Wisconsin State College, Whitewater, The Registrar
 University of Wisconsin, Madison, Kenneth Little, Registrar
 Viterbo College, La Crosse, Sister M. Dolorita, Registrar

WYOMING

Casper Junior College, Casper, M. F. Griffith, Dean
 University of Wyoming, Laramie, R. E. McWhinnie, Registrar

ALASKA

University of Alaska, College, The Registrar

CANADA

Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia, Miss R. M. Thompson, Registrar
 University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Geoffrey Bradford Taylor, Registrar
 University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Charles B. Wood,
 Registrar
 Carleton College, Ottawa, Ontario, E. F. Sheffield, Registrar
 The University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, D. Chevrier, Registrar
 McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, T. H. Matthews, Registrar; W. Bruce Ross,
 Assistant Registrar
 McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, C. Linton, Acting Registrar
 Mount Saint Vincent College, Rockingham, Nova Scotia, Sister Francis d'Assisi, Dean
 Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Jean Royce, Registrar
 St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, The Registrar
 The University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, N. K. Cram, Registrar
 Sir George Williams College, Montreal, Douglass Burns Clarke, Registrar
 University of Toronto, Toronto, J. C. Evans, Registrar
 University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario

CUBA

Universidad de Santo Tomas de Villanueva, Marianao, Rev. James M. Seymour,
 O.S.A.

EGYPT

The American University at Cairo, Cairo, The Registrar

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Helen B. MacNeil, Registrar

MEXICO

Mexico City College, Mexico, D. F., Mrs. Elizabeth Lopez, Registrar
 Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Monterrey, N. L.,
 Ing. Victor Bravo Ahuja, Dean of Admissions

PUERTO RICO

Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico, San German, The Registrar
 University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, Harris F. Bunker, Registrar
 Santa Maria University, Ponce, Sister M. Joseph Lorraine, C. S. J., Registrar

PHILIPPINES

University of the Philippines, Manila, Paterno Santos, Registrar
 University of the East, Manila, Fidel R. Colmenar, Registrar

REPUBLIC OF LEBANON

American University of Beirut, Beirut, Farid A. Fuleihan, Registrar

HONORARY MEMBERS

- Mrs. Anna LeFevre Boyer, Gibson City, Illinois
Alice L. Butler, E. Chestnut St., Oxford, Ohio
Lorena M. Church, 2025 Melrose, Rockford, Illinois
Edith C. Cockins, 1580 Guilford Road, Columbus, Ohio
C. E. Friley, President, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
Ezra L. Gillis, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky
M. E. Gladfelter, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Mrs. Lelia G. Hartman, 542 N.E. 107th Street, Miami 38, Florida
Ralph E. Hill, 113 Coral Avenue, Louisville 6, Kentucky
William S. Hoffman, 356 E. Fairmount Ave., State College, Pennsylvania
Pres. E. J. Howell, Tarleton State College, Stephenville, Texas
Agness J. Kaufman, 4605 S. Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois
E. B. Lemon, Dean of Admissions, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon
C. S. Marsh, 507 S. Genesee Avenue, Los Angeles 36, California
E. J. Matthews, University of Texas, Austin, Texas
Florence McCahey, 1267 South 27th, Lincoln, Nebraska
Charles M. McConn, 628 Madison Avenue, York, Pennsylvania
Ernest C. Miller, 102 W. Lexington Avenue, Danville, Kentucky
John P. Mitchell, Stanford University, Stanford, California
Mrs. Josephine Morrow, 1423 N. Tejon Street, Colorado Springs, Colorado
K. P. R. Neville, R.R. #3, London, Ontario, Canada
Ella Oleson, 115 South Polk Street, Moscow, Idaho
Alfred H. Parrott, Exec. Sec., Alumni & Former Student Ass'n., State College Station, Fargo, North Dakota
E. B. Pierce, Alumni Secretary, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Carrie Mae Probst, 1000 St. Dunstons Road, Baltimore 12, Maryland
C. P. Steimle, 317 S. Huron Street, Ypsilanti, Michigan
R. B. Stone, 615 Russell Street, West Lafayette, Indiana
Elida Yakeley, 7825 Exchange Place, La Jolla, California